[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
LONG [illegible]
[illegible]

DAVID URQUHART

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/urquhartsomechap00robi

David Urquhart

DAVID URQUHART

SOME CHAPTERS IN THE LIFE OF A VICTORIAN KNIGHT-ERRANT OF JUSTICE AND LIBERTY

BY

GERTRUDE ROBINSON

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

F. F. URQUHART

FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE

BOSTON AND NEW YORK

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO.

1920

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Dedicated

TO THE MEMORY OF THE

MEN AND WOMEN OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEES

AND OF ALL THOSE

LOYAL AND SELF-SACRIFICING FRIENDS OF DAVID URQUHART

FROM WHOM HE EXPECTED SO MUCH

AND IN WHOM

HE WAS NOT DISAPPOINTED

PREFACE

This study of a great though little-known personality of the last century is not presented to the reading public as in any sense an adequate biography. It may be regarded as a preparation for a Life which still remains to be written. The immense mass of material to be dealt with, involving all the most vital diplomatic and international questions of the last century, would have made the preparation of such a Life a matter of time, and could only have been successfully undertaken by an able historian.

David Urquhart during a long life never ceased to preach doctrines and make claims which the world derided. The last five years have set the seal on the truth of those doctrines, and justified many of those claims. But the man himself has been forgotten. It seems now a fitting time when, in common gratitude for his life of toil and self-sacrifice, his memory should be revived.

All the manuscript and most of the other materials used in the preparation of this book have been very kindly placed at the author's disposal by Mr. David Urquhart, Mr. Urquhart's eldest son. She owes more than she can adequately acknowledge to the help and co-operation of Miss Urquhart and Mr. F. F. Urquhart of Balliol College. Most of the drudgery involved in the reading, selection, and

tabulation of a great mass of almost unarranged correspondence was undertaken by Miss Urquhart, as well as a great deal of necessary research at the Record Office and the British Museum. Apart from this, the book in one respect at least owes whatever psychological interest it may possess to her. Her mind, probably unconsciously to herself, reproduced in that of the author the impression made on her, while still a sensitive and imaginative child, by her father's unique personality.

Mr. F. F. Urquhart, in addition to the constant and valuable advice and criticism which he gave during the whole time the book was in preparation, made himself responsible for the whole of the indexing. To him the author is also indebted for the correction of the proof-sheets, as well as to Mrs. V. M. Crawford, who with her knowledge of the technicalities of printing has been of invaluable help.

OXFORD,
December, 1919.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	PREFACE	vii
	PROLOGUE	xi
	INTRODUCTION	1
	PART I.—THE KNIGHT	
CHAPTER		
I.	WHAT MANNER OF MAN HE WAS	19
II.	URQUHART AT CONSTANTINOPLE	44
III.	THE EAST AND MEDIAEVAL INSTITUTIONS	64
	PART II.—HOW HE FOUGHT FOR JUSTICE IN ENGLAND	
IV.	CHARTISM	81
V.	FOREIGN AFFAIRS ASSOCIATIONS	104
VI.	THE FORMATION OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEES	120
VII.	THE AIMS AND WORK OF THE COMMITTEES	141
VIII.	WHY THE COMMITTEES SUCCEEDED AND WHY THEY FAILED	166
	PART III.—HOW HE WENT TO ROME	
IX.	URQUHART AND HIS EARLIER RELATIONS TO ROME	179
X.	"UNITED ITALY"	194
XI.	URQUHART IN SAVOY	205
XII.	URQUHART'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH	218
XIII.	THE APPEAL TO THE POPE	231
XIV.	THE VATICAN COUNCIL	250
XV.	THE LAST CHAPTER	274
	APPENDIXES	301
	INDEX	323

LIST OF PLATES

	TO FACE PAGE
DAVID URQUHART, ÆT. CIRCA 69 - - -	*Frontispiece*
DAVID URQUHART, ÆT. 12 AND 63 - - - -	20
DAVID URQUHART SHORTLY AFTER HIS MARRIAGE - -	121
POSTER ISSUED BY THE PRESTON FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE	134
CHALET DES MÉLÈZES - - - - - -	206

PROLOGUE

THEN the Kings having denied Christ, made new gods and idols, and exposed them to the sight of nations, and ordered men to fall down and worship and fight for them.

And they made for the French an idol, and they called it Honour—and it was the same idol that in former times was called the *Golden Calf*.

And for the Spaniards they made an idol and called it *Political Preponderance*, and it was the same idol that the Assyrians adored under the name of *Baal*, and the Philistines under the name of *Dagon*, and the Romans under that of *Jupiter*.

And for the English their King made an idol, and called it *Sovereignty of the Seas*, and it was the same god that was formerly named *Mammon*.

And for the Germans they made an idol which they called Well-Being, the same that formerly had the names of *Moloch* and *Comus*.

And the people adored their idols.

And the King said to the French: "Be up and fight for *Honour*."

And the people arose and combated for 500 years.

And the King said to the English: "Get up and fight for *Mammon*." And they arose and combated for 500 years.

And so the other nations, each for his idol.

And in Europe idolatry flourished—and as the Pagans had first adored different virtues under the forms of idols and afterwards so adored different vices, and then men, and beasts, and finally trees, and stones, and figures, and geometry, so also did it happen in Europe.

For the Italians created for themselves an idol, which

they named *Political Equilibrium*. Now this was an idol which the ancient Pagans had never known; and the Italians were the first to invent its worship, and in combating for it they became weak and stupid, and fell into the hands of petty tyrants.

Then the Kings of Europe, seeing that this idol had exhausted the Italian nation, caused it to be brought into their States and propagated its worship, and ordered men to combat for it.

After this the King of Prussia traced a circle and said, "Behold a new God"; and the circle was adored, and the worship was henceforth called *Arrondissement*.

Then came three Kings whose names were Blasphemy, who, seeing that the people were not sufficiently corrupted, raised on high a new idol, the most terrible of all; and that idol was called Interest. That idol was not known to the Pagans of Antiquity.

However, all the people adored *Interest*, and the Kings said: "If we propagate the worship of this idol, it will happen that, as there is to-day between nation and nation, so will there happen, then, war between town and town, between man and man.

"And men will become savages again."

ADAM MICKIEWICZ: *The Book of Polish Pilgrims.*

These idols have all been broken, and a greater one has now taken their place. This Idol is Chance—he is propitiated with wave offerings and burnt offerings of *laws*, *rights*, *usages*, and *traditions*—his high-priest is Diplomacy, his temple was Congress—is Cabinet. By *whispers* he sears the heart of man. He changes all things past, corrupts all things present, and disposes all things to come. He was known among the ancient Pagans as *Iniquity*, but was considered a Demon and not a God.

The Portfolio (New Series), vol. ii., No. V.

DAVID URQUHART

INTRODUCTION

It is not easy to write about the life and work of a man who set himself consciously and diametrically against the opinion of his time. A biographer has but two courses open to him, either to argue that in important matters, at any rate, opinion was wrong and his view right, an undertaking of perilous length and difficulty, or to "explain" his hero, to put in a plea, in other words, for extenuating circumstances. The second alternative is a confession of failure, and no one who knows and admires David Urquhart would be so poor-spirited as to adopt it. Silence would be preferable, silence until the enemy had surrendered, until opinion had so changed that much which had seemed preposterous paradox had become accepted or at least acceptable.

The opinions which Urquhart attacked have not yet been entirely abandoned, they have not yet been transformed, as he would have said, into judgments. They have, however, shifted their ground, and much that he wrote and said would be better understood now than in his lifetime.

The catastrophe which he foretold has come upon us. It may not have come from the quarter from which he expected it, but it has been the result of those principles of international iniquity against which his voice was

lifted in season and out of season. The purpose of this book is mainly to show the moral principles which underlay his many activities, and it would be impossible within a reasonable compass to examine his convictions about the international events and the leading statesmen of his time. Yet principle was with him so closely connected with facts, so much of his life and energy were spent in battling against Russia and all her deeds, that it is essential at least to show that his whole conception of the international history of his time was not the incredible thing it seemed to most of his contemporaries. When they saw the workings of popular forces, of national movements or of mere chance, David Urquhart detected the deliberate policy of Russia. Russia was to him a Power essentially weak and inorganic which had yet by the semblance of strength, by the extreme intelligence of her ministers, and by her unhesitating rejection of all scruple, been able to pursue, since the days of Peter the Great, a policy of almost uninterrupted conquest. Her success was due not to military achievements, but to diplomacy, to the skill with which she weakened the other European States by setting them against one another or by using against them, though herself the most autocratic of Powers, the weapon of Revolution. Every European State was threatened by the Russian danger, but her immediate victim was the Turkish Empire. Once established on the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles she could control South-Eastern Europe and the Near East, she could interpose her portentous bulk between Europe and Asia. The Mediterranean would be her path to power in the West, while in the East she would threaten the Indian Empire. Among the Turks, however, were to be found not only

great military qualities, but certain convictions on the essential connection between righteousness and public action, between religion and politics which had been almost forgotten in the West. The Turks were therefore the appointed antagonists of Russia because they were diametrically opposed to her policy of systematic injustice, and it was an essential article in David Urquhart's creed that Turkey, left to herself, was more than a match for Russia. The great object of Russian diplomacy was therefore to secure the help of the Powers in disorganising or breaking up the Turkish Empire—and this, he maintained, they had frequently done even when they professed to be acting as her friends. Contemporary history was to him a tremendous living drama in which the greatest moral issue was at stake. Russia was the great adversary, working for her end by the gradual demoralisation of Europe. She represented the principle of evil in international affairs, the attempt to exclude them altogether from the domain of the Moral Law. Before her day other countries and sovereigns had acted unjustly. She acted on the principle of injustice. And she worked in secret, by her hold over individual statesmen in other countries, by the press, by revolutionary influences, by men and movements often enough intentionally opposed to her. Her power lay in her one, single, Satanic vision of her aims, while the feeble men in whose hesitating hands lay the defence of the Moral Law were confused by uncertain aims, by hazy views of national justice, and by words which they used without understanding them, such words as democratic government, ministerial responsibility, nationality and the rest. "Our Antagonist," Urquhart wrote, "scrutinises the earth for

talents, and having found them, disciplines them to an order which has never been matched, and inspires them with the prospects of a triumph never yet attained. There are united superiority of mind, unity of system, permanency of purpose, the coercion of an iron rule, the inspiration of a golden harvest and the doubly fortifying sense of confidence in themselves and contempt for the rest of mankind. . . . For those who manage the affairs of Russia every branch of science, every field of knowledge, and every motive of the human mind is equally possessed and mastered, and the combination of the whole is—Diplomacy."*

To the immense majority of his contemporaries this conception of Russia and of the character of her power seemed the imaginings of a distorted if not of a diseased brain. Have we any reason after sixty years to question this verdict ?

To begin with, most men would admit the truth of David Urquhart's passionate conviction, underlying all his conception of " foreign politics," that there was a fundamental antagonism between two principles, one which required in the acts of the State merely the pursuit of a policy, the other which demanded before all else that they should conform to the eternal principles of justice, and they would agree that the triumph of the former would mean an absolute perversion of the very basis on which human society is built. Thoughtful men had long realised the existence of this antagonism, and dreaded the consequences of the apparently growing indifference to all issues save those of national advantage; and the war has opened the eyes of many more to the fatal consequences of unrestrained national ambition.

* *Progress of Russia*, Fifth Edition, pp. lxv.-vi. and lxix.

For one thing we are beginning to understand that the national movements, which were welcomed so enthusiastically in England, contained much that was evil, at least in their methods. It was the custom a few years back to admire Bismarck and to excuse his methods of blood and iron because they had been successful in bringing about German unity. Immediate success clouded the judgments of his contemporaries even in England. Indeed the whole popular verdict on "Nationality," which Urquhart distrusted intensely, is already being revised in the light of increasing national ambitions and national hatreds.

It may be claimed, then, that time has confirmed David Urquhart's moral judgments; can it be said to have justified his political insight? He is obviously open to the charge of having mistaken the real enemy, of having made Russia the Antagonist when it should have been Prussia. As a matter of fact he always insisted on the close connection between the two Powers, though Prussia, and even Bismarck, he considered to be the tools of Russia. The international policy of both countries was based on the same principle of injustice, the difference lay in the means. Russia, fundamentally weak, internally divided, was driven to use the weapon of diplomacy, Germany in the years after '70 was strong enough to be frankly brutal. In any case the Prussianising of Germany in the late years of the nineteenth century does not immediately affect the historical question of Russian policy and influence in the period between 1815 and 1870.

Certainly no contemporary historian would be prepared to accept in its entirety David Urquhart's account of the international politics amid which he lived.

Perhaps future revelations may confirm a number of his convictions, but too much must not be expected from further publications of documents. It is one of the difficulties of the history of the last century that so much of importance was communicated in private correspondence and may never be at the historian's disposal. At any rate all that is possible now is to point out how mysterious a great deal of nineteenth-century history still remains, and how in a number of cases increased knowledge has only deepened the mystery.

The period of the Congresses, the years following the Congress of Vienna, has been the object of much research and many books, and yet two diametrically opposite explanations are still facing each other. The explanation more commonly accepted by English writers makes Metternich the soul of the system. In the interests of "legitimacy," of the counter-Revolution, he persuaded Alexander of Russia to abandon his liberalism, to throw himself into the Conservative camp and to use the Holy Alliance for the purpose of suppressing revolutions in Spain, Italy, and elsewhere. The rival theory makes Russia not only the inaugurator, but also the motive power behind the Alliance; and the object of Russia throughout is to promote intervention in other countries in order to set the Western nations against one another and to profit by the confusion. To bring about intervention, revolutions had first to be set afoot, and writers of this school are prepared to show that Russian agents were at work both in Spain and Italy before the insurrection of 1820. It would seem at first sight incredible that a country like Russia, the embodiment of conservatism and autocracy, should

be stirring up revolutionary fires; yet the very fact that Russia was so much outside the European system, so remote from the flame, made it safer for her statesmen to promote revolution in other countries. Sorel has himself pointed out how Alexander I. contrived to be "the hidden deity of the Revolutionaries while remaining the public god of the Conservatives." And what Sorel said of Alexander, most idealistic of the Czars, is only what David Urquhart said all his life of the general policy of Russia. Certain it is that whether Russia was to any degree responsible for the Revolution of 1820, it was Russia, and not Metternich, who first proposed intervention, and it was Russia who at the Congress of Verona ultimately forced it on the French Government by using Chateaubriand. As it turned out, French intervention was not resented by the Spaniards as a people, and the general peace of Europe, which a prolonged war in Spain would certainly have destroyed, was preserved.

In the East again it is to the personal influence of Metternich over the impressionable Alexander that Russia's abandonment of the Greeks during the earlier years of their rebellion is usually attributed. It is pleasant to substitute for a difficult study of facts and documents a lively discussion of Alexander's character and of the temperament which so exercised the chancelleries of Europe, but in Russian history the direct influence of a Czar's personality is nearly always exaggerated. The real control of events has generally been in the hands of a much less impressionable minister. The connection of Russia with the Greek Revolt is of primary importance in David Urquhart's life. It was his first great lesson in the power of diplomacy; it

convinced him of the ignorance which prevailed in the West about all Eastern matters. The scene of the drama was one with which he was familiar. He had fought for the Greeks and he knew their detestation of Russia. He had lived with the Turks and realised their great military qualities. In his inquiries into the diplomatic forces which brought about the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino and the Peace of Adrianople, so disastrous to Turkey, he was assisted by a strange and almost unique discovery. The Polish rebellion of 1830 placed the Poles for some time in command of Warsaw, and there they found a number of diplomatic documents; these were copies of despatches which had been sent to the Russian Viceroy Constantine, Nicholas I.'s elder brother, the man who had given up his right to the throne and was therefore treated with great consideration by the Russian Government. These despatches were ultimately sent to England, and some of them appeared, with the consent of the Government, in *The Portfolio*, edited by Urquhart and some of his friends. To the casual reader these Russian secret despatches do not contain any startling revelations, but every here and there phrases are met with which bring out the point of view of the Russian ministers and are full of meaning to one who knows the facts. They certainly confirmed Urquhart in the judgments he had formed about Russian policy.

He started with the conviction of the inherent weakness of Russia on the one hand, in spite of the commanding position which she held at the time, and of the military strength of Turkey on the other. Russia therefore could not afford to attack Turkey single-handed. It was not sufficient for her to get a free

hand in the East by embroiling the Western Powers with one another; she must secure the help of one or more of them in her attack on Turkey. This she ultimately succeeded in doing, partly owing to the sympathy felt in the West towards the Greeks, partly owing to the very fear with which Western statesmen regarded the independent action of Russia in the East. Canning was anxious to settle the Greek question by arbitration between Greeks and Turks. If he had acted single-handed he might have done so, and it is obvious that Russia feared his independent action. She therefore threatened Turkey in a quarrel of her own, disconnected with the Greek question, and Canning then came to terms with Russia, hoping to check her by working with her. But union with Russia made a friendly settlement between Greeks and Turks impossible, and step by step the English and French Governments were led on till, without declaration of war, and while they still professed to be allies of Turkey, the fleets of England, France, and Russia destroyed the Turkish Fleet at Navarino. Russia was now in a position to attack Turkey. Navarino had given her the command of the Black Sea and of the Ægean. Yet in spite of this advantage the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29 would probably have ended in a Russian disaster if the Sultan had not been persuaded by disloyal ministers and the ill-informed and timid representatives of England and France to sign in a panic the Peace of Adrianople. It is true that Diebitch was in Adrianople with a Russian army, but his troops were dying of fever and he could not advance on Constantinople. Behind him there was a Turkish army north of the Balkans; another was advancing from the west under the Pasha

of Widdin. The destruction of Diebitch's army seemed almost inevitable if the Sultan had held out, and so signal a Russian disaster might have had almost incalculable consequences. Even as it was the Poles were able in the following year to keep the field for ten months against the Czar's armies. The victory of Turkey would probably have meant the emancipation of Poland and a complete and wholesome change in the history of Russia.

An inner knowledge of this phase of the Eastern Question not only strengthened Urquhart's convictions on the relative strength of Russia and Turkey, it also confirmed his suspicions about Russia's diplomatic methods. Pozzo di Borgo, the Corsican, was, for instance, just one of those able foreigners who became the most efficient servants of Russia. As an ambassador at Paris he had a great personal share in the success of the Russian policy. Such were his relations with the French Court that at one moment it was seriously proposed that he should be appointed French War Minister. A more enigmatic position still was that held in London by Countess Lieven, the wife of the Russian Ambassador. She was at different times with the Duke of Wellington, with Lord Grey, with Palmerston and other prominent men on terms of intimacy which seem to us incredible, especially as she never forgot that she represented Russia. It was at a private meeting between Canning and the Lievens that he seems first to have abandoned that isolated action in the Greek question which Russia disliked. Countess Lieven's own point of view is perhaps best expressed in a postscript to one of her letters to her brother, written in the winter of 1828, when the comparative

failure of the first campaign against the Turks had astonished Europe. "Defeat the Turks, for the love of God! Europe is growing insubordinate since it thinks we cannot do so."

The subsequent history of the Near East, as Urquhart saw it, was not likely to diminish his sense of the power and danger of Russian diplomacy. He saw her statesmen use the rise of Mehemet Ali in Egypt first, to secure what was practically a protectorate of Turkey in 1833 and, when that too brilliant success roused the hostility of the Western Powers, he saw her use the same weapon in 1840 in order to break up, with the help of Lord Palmerston, the Anglo-French Entente of 1830. The crisis, which had brought England and France to the verge of war, was over in 1841, but by making Mehemet Ali an hereditary Pasha of Egypt the Powers which had come to Turkey's help combined to inflict on her a blow more serious, perhaps, than the ephemeral predominance of an overmighty subject. The success of a rebellious Pasha had been a fairly frequent phenomenon in the history of the Ottoman Empire, but the establishment of a dynasty in Egypt was a step towards the permanent loss of that province.

The Crimean War might seem at first sight to be the fulfilment of David Urquhart's ambitions. Now at last England and France were united with Turkey in a war against Russia's attempt to ruin the Turkish Empire by securing a protectorate over three-quarters of her subjects in Europe. And yet this war, though it began with a Russian defeat by the unaided Turks, ended in what was practically a drawn fight between Russia on the one side, and the two Western Powers, Turkey and Sardinia, on the other. Sebastopol itself

was never taken in a military sense, and we had to have a clause inserted in the Preliminaries of Peace to allow us to use its harbour for the embarkation of our troops. It is hardly too much to say that the prestige with which the Crimean War endowed Russia gave her a decisive voice in all questions concerned with the East until her war with Japan. It is a period full of historical mysteries. Why did the war break out? Why did the Allies when they were at Varna never make the least attempt to help the Turks in Silistria? Why did we attack Sebastopol, almost the only fortified Russian port in the Black Sea? Why did we prevent the Turks from helping the Circassians in the Caucasus? Why, during the whole of the war, was Russian trade allowed to pass unmolested through the Bosphorus? The list of such questions could be extended almost indefinitely. The Crimean War was not likely to diminish Urquhart's intense suspicion of the current diplomatic methods and his conviction that Russia had agents, whether conscious or unconscious, in the ministries of Europe.

To most of his contemporaries the maddest thing about David Urquhart was his belief in the treason of Lord Palmerston, and it is most unlikely that time will ever justify that belief. Yet it is now much easier to see how a man of Urquhart's knowledge of the inner world of diplomacy could be absolutely sincere in such a conviction. Palmerston is certainly one of the most remarkable enigmas of our nineteenth-century history. At first all is simple enough. A representative of the ideas and prejudices of the English middle class, a man without inspiration and with little scruple, yet eminently efficient, his political success is easily ex-

plained. He pleased the Tories by the vigour of his foreign policy, the Whigs by his spirit of compromise at home, the Radicals by the support he gave to national movements and extreme parties abroad. He had, in addition, a very good "press," he came to be on terms of great intimacy with Delane of *The Times*. The cheerful optimist of the cartoons of *Punch* is still the Palmerston of tradition as he was the Palmerston whom most Englishmen knew and liked. He certainly enjoyed the fruits of popularity, and during the fifty-five years of his political life he was only about ten years out of office. Even when, in 1857, the House of Commons revolted against the iniquities of the China War the constituencies returned him with a substantial majority. His importance in our history, however, depends more on his control of our foreign affairs than on his Whig leadership. During the middle years of the century the relations between England and the rest of the world depended far more upon Lord Palmerston than on any other man, and to the Continent he was a figure very unlike that of the genial Whig. To foreigners he seemed arrogant, offensive, passionate. That is the picture we get of him in the letters of the eminently moderate Leopold I. of Belgium. The foreign Liberals he alienated by his bullying methods even when they profited by his policy, while the Conservatives could explain the alliance between this English aristocrat and continental revolutionary forces only by a deliberate bargain: the revolutionaries were to leave England undisturbed in return for support abroad. After all, what could be more offensive to a foreigner than the famous "Civis Romanus sum" speech? A speech which won Palmerston immense

popularity in England. It apparently claimed for an Englishman in a foreign country the rights which a Roman citizen enjoyed within the bounds of the Roman Empire. The wiser men of his time realised the injury that Palmerston was doing to the peace of Europe and the position of England, and Peel's last speech in the House of Commons was a grave protest against a diplomacy which was used "to fester every wound, to provoke, instead of soothing, resentments."* A study of the crisis of 1840 when Palmerston shattered the Anglo-French Entente and brought the two countries to the brink of war would confirm every word of Peel's protest.

It is extraordinary that there should be no adequate Life of Palmerston, no attempt to replace the partial portraits of more or less "official" biographies by a real picture, and to explain the contradiction of his character and career. Passion probably accounted for much. He had real, deeply felt, personal resentments towards the rulers of other States, towards Metternich and Louis Philippe, for instance; and even towards other countries, especially Austria. But such personal resentments do not account for everything, and much remains in his foreign policy that is puzzling. Fortunately materials for a real biography are slowly accumulating. Queen Victoria's *Letters* and Lord Fitzmaurice's *Life of Lord Granville* have revealed Palmerston's attitude towards the Queen and his fellow-ministers, but it is by his relations with the idealism of his time that he will ultimately stand or fall. In any final judgment the charges brought against him by David Urquhart with such intensity of con-

* Parker's *Life of Peel*, iii., 543.

viction will have to be considered. To Urquhart Palmerston was the representative of the great Adversary, of that immoral principle in the affairs of nations which he identified with Russia; and he was prepared to prove that in spite of the appearances of hostility Palmerston's policy had always in the long run been to the advantage of Russia. Whether this was so or not is a matter of evidence, and much of his criticism is of the highest value. But it is a long step from failure, and even from injustice, to treason. Urquhart's whole character and life had tended to make him attribute to deliberate purpose much that is due, in the actions of men, to passion, or ambition, or mere thoughtlessness and want of foresight. He placed Palmerston on too high a level intellectually, made him too much of a Satan, and did not recognise that even he had a good deal of "l'homme moyen, sensuel" in his nature.

On the whole, then, it may be said that Urquhart's judgments on the events of his day would be listened to with more respect now than they were by the majority of his contemporaries, and that much still remains very obscure in the diplomatic history of the last century. Certainly no student of those times can afford to neglect the mass of material, the evidence drawn from unexpected sources, and the startling and impressive judgments which are to be found in David Urquhart's writings, and in the reviews or papers which he inspired and to which he contributed.

PART I

THE KNIGHT

"My soul breaketh out for the very fervent desire: that it hath alway unto Thy judgments."—*Psalm* cxix. (Prayer-Book version.)

"Et custodiam legem tuam semper,
In sæculum et in sæculun sæculi.
Et ambulabam in latitudine,
Quia mandata tua exquisivi.
Et loquebar in testimoniis tuis in conspectu regum
Et non confundebar."

Psalm cxvii. 44, 46 (Vulgate).

CHAPTER I

WHAT MANNER OF MAN HE WAS

"Libera me de sanguinibus, Deus, Deus salutis meae,
Et exultabit lingua mea justitiam tuam."
Psalm l. (Vulgate).

THIS book does not profess to be a Life of David Urquhart.

It is merely a story of his two greatest attempts to avert the ruin which was already hanging over Europe, though only seers like himself, or Cobbett, or William Morris could discern its dark and sinister signs.

Urquhart saw them more clearly than the others of the Brotherhood, because he had an opportunity, which they had not, of comparing things as they were with things as they had been in a more healthful state of society

Many attempts have been made to write his Life, but they have all failed because his biographers were so blinded with admiration for their hero that they could not see his defects.

Let us begin, therefore, by pointing out what Urquhart was not.

He was not a statesman, in spite of his great knowledge of statecraft.

He was not a historian, in spite of his wide knowledge of history; for he was neither logical nor accurate, nor had he any idea of the value of evidence.

He was not a psychologist, in spite of his interest in and love for human nature; his mind was always at work comparing men with what they ought to be rather than realising them as they were.

But he was a prophet. His historical next of kin are Cassandra and Jeremiah. For it is only after the catastrophe has come that his countrymen can see how true were the words he spoke. Indeed, we hear them now on

all sides, though most of those who utter them do not know their origin. Labour leaders, religious teachers, Mediævalists, Guild Socialists, promoters of Leagues of Nations, those who hate the Peace terms, all speak his language now.

Born ten years before the battle of Waterloo on his family estate in the Scottish Highlands, Urquhart started life with that fiercest form of aristocracy, Scottish pride of race; and an aristocrat he remained to the day of his death. But, thanks to his cosmopolitan education,[1] his interest in commerce and his close and intimate friendship with men of the working classes on his Foreign Affairs Committees, the aristocratic spirit he had inherited was counterbalanced by a democratic conscience, which he acquired and which was none the less true and sincere because he was, and always remained, a monarchist. His knowledge of the East taught him the respect and courtesy due from one man to another, irrespective of class distinctions, and a dramatic incident of his early manhood, which

[1] Urquhart's education was conducted by his mother in an altogether original manner. He was delicate as a child, and at ten years old she took him abroad with a tutor. They lived in France, Switzerland, and Italy, and Urquhart's studies were superintended by first one tutor, then another, more or less unsatisfactorily.

His first real settled education took place at the College of Sorèze, famous later as the scene of Lacordaire's labours amongst his beloved "jeunesse."

Sorèze was interesting enough in its history to fire the imagination of such a boy as David Urquhart.

Founded in 757, under Pepin le Bref, as an abbey, it became a military school about 1,000 years later, under the Benedictines. Secularised at the Revolution, it still retained its original character because it remained in the hands of its old superiors, who became laymen for the time being. It was still under this régime when Urquhart was sent there in 1817. In 1854 it became a Dominican school under Lacordaire.

At Sorèze Urquhart's education began in earnest. He was at school as an extern from 5.30 a.m. until 7 at night, and often sat up till midnight preparing his lessons for the next day.

He had a tutor to help him with Latin and Greek, but Mrs. Urquhart describes him as a "heavy burden." "His master," she says in a letter to David's half-sister, Henrietta, "does not even raise him. I have had him so often vexed that I have a woman to come on purpose to wake him. We keep the fire in, and sometimes his anxiety is such that he gets up at 3 o'clock and studies."

No wonder an old friend writes to Mrs. Urquhart: "I cannot think that it is good for our darling David to study such long hours."

Æt. 63

DAVID URQUHART

Æt. 12

Drawn and coloured by his mother in a letter to his step-sister

took place there, aroused into vigorous life a passion for justice, which upheld him through years of almost hopeless struggle against national and social injustice and immorality.

For David Urquhart was a crusader first and foremost. It is true that he was many other things as well: a diplomatist too honest for the diplomatic world of his day; a politician with aims too lofty to succeed in politics; a philosopher, who rose above the barren intellectuality and utilitarianism of the utilitarian school of his day, though Jeremy Bentham was a friend of his impressionable youth; a writer, whose writings, in spite of the careless diction which too often mars them, rose sometimes to heights of poetic beauty; a prophet, who fifty years ago foretold the woes which have fallen on this generation. But all these noble qualities were burnt to a white heat in the furnace of his passion for the re-establishment of justice in the world. That is the key which unlocks all the chambers of a mind full of interests and gifts. That is the torch which lights all the secret recesses of a personality at once complex and contradictory. That was the one dream, the one hope of his life. For that he spent money recklessly, lavishly, heedless not only of his own future, but, later on, of that of his children. For that he laboured night and day in spite of sufferings, which were a "baptism of pain." For that, with a nature affectionate and sensitive to an almost inconceivable degree, he put aside the natural desire of a man for a home and human love till his fiftieth year, and offered after his marriage, not himself alone, but the wife to whom he was devoted, a willing sacrifice to the cause.

Few people have been so misjudged. David Urquhart was a "megalo-maniac." His unceasing hostility and opposition to Lord Palmerston was the result of "disappointed ambition." The political aim of a man who loathed parties was "to form a party, that should be called after his own name." He, the bitterest foe of Russia, was in her pay, or if he was not, his friends were. All his convictions were the result of "insensate vanity," of "wounded pride," of "mad extravagance."

On the other hand, men of all classes, of all shades of religious and political opinion, of all nations and of all grades of intellect were attracted to him. But in all these there was a certain nobility and simplicity, which enabled them to recognise the same nobility in his freedom from self-seeking, his absolute justice, and the sincerity and purity of his character, through all the many and conspicuous faults that marred it, his extravagance, his sometimes apparent and sometimes real egoism, and his overbearing manner, which alienated many who would have been his friends and gave to his enemies many very welcome occasions of scandal.

His influence was by no means confined to men of his own country.

Alone almost of Englishmen, he was admitted to intimacy with the Turks. He might live in a Mohammedan house, eat at a Mohammedan table, receive the "Temena" or Mohammedan greeting.

It was no secret that he might, while still a young man, had he chosen, have remained in Turkey as confidential adviser to the Sultan. The Circassians, seeing in him at first sight a simplicity and nobility akin to their own, wished to make him their Chief, and, because of him, placed in English honour and in English arms a confidence which tended to their undoing.

"Daoud Bey" they called him, and in the East "Daoud Bey" was a name to conjure with to the last year of his life, when, sick almost to death, he travelled through Egypt, "en prince," receiving the homage of Pashas and peasants, to some of whom that name had been from their youth a household word.

A Protestant to the last, in spite of his conviction that the Papacy was "the only moral force in Europe," he won and kept the whole-hearted respect of prominent Catholic ecclesiastics, German, Italian and French, as well as English. So great an impression did he make on the Papal Legate Cappaccini in 1844 that Pope Gregory XVI. summoned him to the Vatican to confer with him about the foundation of a diplomatic College in Rome. Père Gratry,

M. le Play, the General of the Jesuits, Monsignor, afterwards Cardinal, Franchi, the Bishop of Geneva, the famous Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, were on terms of friendship, in some cases of intimacy, with him. "God has inspired you with very great ideas on the greatest of subjects," said Pius IX. to him at a private audience.

And yet the majority of English statesmen were either entirely indifferent or actively hostile to him. There were notable exceptions. As quite a young man on his return from Constantinople he was high in the favour and confidence of William IV. Disraeli recognised his greatness as *he* recognised Disraeli's possibilities, and there was a great and striking unanimity between his point of view and that of Disraeli at his loftiest and best. Lord Ponsonby, who was at least partly responsible for the wreck of his diplot matic career in 1837, became reconciled to him after years of estrangement, and admitted that he had been right from the beginning, and that he alone could save England.

The barrier between Urquhart and the statesmen of his time is due very largely to his unremitting and intense hostility to Russia. By his enemies this hostility was sneered at as a form of mono-mania; even by many disposed to sympathise with him his politics were deemed unsound because he proposed to humble Russia by the exaltation of Turkey.

In 1834 Urquhart published his pamphlet *Turkey and Her Resources*, showing the military and commercial strength of that country, with its rich lands and free trade; where the hearth was the factory; where every citizen had the right to wear the sword, which he might only wield, however, in the cause of right and justice. The knowledge he had gained of her people and her commerce enabled him to draw up his Commercial Treaty, whose object was to encourage trade between Great Britain and Turkey. Thathis Commercial Treaty was so altered as to defeat the end he had in view, he was doubtless right in putting down to Russian intrigue, and he pointed out with great clearness to the working classes of England that the dearness of their food was due to Russian astuteness and English—particularly Palmerstonian—complacency.

This is no place to inquire how far he was right in regarding every political move in Europe as due to the machinations of the Russian Cabinet. We must remember, however, that not only was the Russian foreign policy of an entirely unbroken uniformity, and her Foreign Ministers, unlike those of the rest of Europe, quite independent of political parties, but that, however we may account for it, within one hundred and fifty years the Russian power had advanced with frightening rapidity. At the time of the Crimean War she was one thousand miles nearer Teheran, seven hundred miles nearer Vienna and Berlin, and five hundred miles nearer Constantinople than she had been at the death of Tsar Peter.[1] Urquhart was not alone in his bitter mistrust of Russia. The Poles looked upon her as their undoing, Turkey was like a fly helpless in her web, and M. Thiers looked forward with dismal prognostications to the time "when the Russian Colossus, with one foot in the Dardanelles and the other in the Sound, will make the whole world his slave and liberty will have fled to America." Urquhart, in the concentration of his mind on Russia, did not, perhaps, lay enough stress on the growing power of Prussia.[2] The separation of the Duchies he regarded not so much as a rung, set by Bismarck, in the ladder of Prussia's rise to power, but as the result of Russian machination.

Mr. Behrens, who helped him in his commercial investigations, gives a remarkable instance of Urquhart's almost supernatural prevision.

"We were walking along the Elbe conversing upon the state of England and Mr. Urquhart's then accomplished career in the East. We sat down on an eminence to enjoy the view, and Mr. Urquhart asked me the name of the country spread out before us. I said, 'Holstein.' He exclaimed, with great excitement, 'Is that Holstein?' and interrupting our conversation he remained with his gaze

[1] *Progress of Russia, West, South, and East*, D. Urquhart, second Edition 1853. It reached five editions. Sir John McNeil, who knew the East almost as well as Urquhart, is even more emphatic about the Russian menace in his *Progress of Russia in the East*.

[2] See, however, *Portfolio*, Old Series, vols. i. and iii., on Prussia's Policy.

intently fixed upon it. I was surprised, and at last answered, and said to him: 'That is Holstein you see, not Timbuctoo.' He turned upon me and said, 'Yes, Holstein! and I was thinking of the day when that name would ring through Europe!' I was desirous to know what all this meant, and he then told me a great deal about the Oldenburgh Line, the renunciations of Peter, and a number of other antiquated matters, which really did not appear to me as much connected with the nineteenth century as the stories of Charlemagne and Barbarossa. I had for a moment misgivings as to whether or not his head had been turned, and I said to myself: 'How extraordinary that a man should understand as he does commercial matters and the East and England, and yet become wild whenever he can bring in Russia!' But when the insurrection came in the Duchies and then the Mediations, and then the interminable fightings about no one knew what, until it came to the Russian Protocols and Reservations, I remembered those words, and often mentioned them; I found it was I, not he, that had been mad. And I came to be considered a prophet at Hamburg by recollecting what he had told me a dozen years before."[1]

His prophecy of the results of the German Zollverein we have seen fulfilled in our day.[2]

"At midnight on January 1, 1834," he says, "the barriers between sixteen States were knocked down. . . . Sixteen States are added to the Prussian system and agglomerated around her disjointed and unconnected territory. . . . It will make Germany indeed one, but that unity will, we fear, be no less disastrous to the parts of which it is composed than to the general interests of the European community of which it is a member. . . . From the moment that Prussia collects and distributes the revenues she places herself, not in the position of a feudal lord, whose revenue was received from his vassals, but in the position of a proprietor, who distributes the means of subsistence to his agents and dependents. . . . Prussian custom-house collectors, her roads, weights, measures, coins, extended throughout the twenty-five millions, now composing the union, will soon be followed by her laws, by State papers,

[1] Private Letter.

[2] See Article by D. U. in the *British and Foreign Review* on "The Prussian Commercial League."

State loans, and finally by conscription, and even at this moment, were the peace of Europe to be disturbed, the Federation would fly to arms at the bidding of Prussia, assemble under her banners, be paid by her from the common treasury, and obey her generals."

In denouncing the folly of the Crimean War Urquhart foretold that Russia would not suffer from it, but that, whether she lost or won, it would be a step on the downward path for Turkey. The Declaration of Paris proved to France in the war of 1870-71 what in 1860 he had said it would prove in the event of a war with Prussia—dire disaster.

This prophetic power of his Urquhart himself called "the power of being right." There was nothing supernatural or extraordinary about it. It was simply the result of a system.

"Look at me," he said to his old friend, the Prince of Samos in 1862, "a man without position, with only mediocre talents, beginning with nothing, and yet I am always right. I cannot conceive the circumstances under which I should be wrong. For if an insoluble position arose I should stop. I should do nothing. Yet I tell you there is nothing in all that I have done that any other man might not have done, might not do. I have only hit upon a method—a method of procedure."

He differed from other men, he would have said, simply in this, his determination to be always right. It was within the power of every man to be right, and therefore his duty.

He could not, he said, believe in a God unless he could believe that a man had in himself this power of being right.

A man can be right, therefore he must be right, or he is not a man.

No allowance is made in the Urquhart philosophy for human weakness. The standard he set for himself he set for others also, without distinction of persons, class or sex. Such an evidence of trust and respect accounts in part for the honour and devotion he met with from his friends of every class, princes and working men alike, in

spite of the harshness, even violence, with which he often treated them.[1] His treatment of them was often as incomprehensible to those who suffered under it as it was to the onlookers. He explained it himself as "the result of his working on men."

Starting from the axiom that it is within the power, and therefore the duty, of every man to be right, he asks, "Why, then, are they not right?" "Because," he answers, "their eyes are blinded by self-love. Men of this corrupt age prefer *seeming* right to *being* right. They are furious when they are shown to be wrong; their self-love is hurt."

Therefore Urquhart's first object was to kill the self-love in those who were possible disciples, and so enable them to see themselves as he had once seen himself. In other words he believed he could effect nothing without a real conversion or new birth. To this end he often, at first, so infuriated men by his scathing and contemptuous language that they left him, determined to have no more to do with him. But he says that, thinking over his words calmly, they invariably found out that he was right, and if they had sufficient courage and truth in them they returned to him and were won. This was the way he won the Chartists; and later on Socialists and Atheists, who came to scoff, were drawn into his net by being shown, as one of them afterwards said, "that they had never been right in their lives."

This was the first step; the second was the development of a conscience in public affairs. Man was born part of a community. He could not live to himself. If wrong were done by the State to which he belonged he could not say, "The Government has done this," and think no more about it.

"*You* have done it," said Urquhart, "and you will be punished in this world and the next. When national injustice is done, who suffers? Each individual in the State

[1] His letters show that he reproved as whole-heartedly and severely his friends, Prince Czartoryski and Prince Frederick of Augustenberg, as he did his working-men disciples; they show also that he was just as respectful to a working-man as to any Crowned Head of Europe with whom he came in contact.

sooner or later, and the working-man first of all, for he is bound to his country and cannot get away from it. And yet people go on thinking that they can be right while the nation of which they are a part is wrong. They do this because they hide their responsibility under an abstraction and say, 'The State does this or that,' not 'I and my fellow-countrymen do this or that.'"

So we come to the third part of Urquhart's system, the cultivation of a right judgment, the first and most important part of which was the right use of words. "Men suppose that their reason has authority over words; but it happens that words in return exercise power over reason," says Francis Bacon. The way to prevent a fact being understood and realised is to clothe it in abstract terms, to enunciate it under a general proposition, to use some term that is so common and yet so loose that it really conveys a false meaning to the minds of people, who think they understand it. Political and philosophical language is full of such terms. Urquhart applied the Socratic method[1] to show their emptiness to all who glibly used them, without regard to their meaning or no-meaning.

The last and most important of all the means of being right was the acquisition of real first-hand knowledge, not someone's opinions, not loose and inaccurate information, but real knowledge. This means hard and self-denying labour. Such labour is everyone's duty, especially in the things that concern the government of his country, which it is the constant concern of all politicians to keep from him, particularly in relation to foreign affairs.

Such was Urquhart's system. In brief, it amounted to this: a man to be right must first cast aside the self he received from his age, and must set his true self to work at the acquisition of knowledge and self-discipline, striving all the time against allowing himself to be infected by the modern spirit and public opinion; when he was himself instructed he must teach others.

The pursuance of this method was as painful and uphill for the master as for the disciples. If the treatment meted

[1] For Urquhart's method of teaching dialectic, see Appendix II.

out, in their training, to men who were devoting life and substance to the great cause seems almost like cruelty, David Urquhart himself spent sleepless nights over their education. But he never flinched in what he conceived to be his duty. "One living soul," he says, "is to me the universe."

"My striving for your soul," he writes to a lady, whom he had convicted of want of intellectual sincerity, "is to get it clear-sighted and upright. It cannot be the last unless it is the first, for at every second of time, with an active mind such as yours, the slightest flaw in an intellectual operation gives a foothold for self-love. My life, alas! is spent in watching these operations. There is scarcely a friend I have from whom the letter I receive may not be the last. I can retain them only by putting them beyond the reach of error and failure, for in that their self-love is offended by being told that they may have been wrong. And yet this alone is the condition on which I can hold intercourse with my fellow-creatures."

This crushing of self-love, "the entire abnegation of self," as he expresses it, was essential for every man among his followers. The little band was leading a forlorn hope. Hitherto their acquaintance with public questions had consisted "in floating on the top of a public frenzy aided by an assenting Government." Joined to his company, however, they were "struggling against the stream." "There were no passions to be worked on, only right to be maintained." No man could put his hand to the plough, not only without a perfect abnegation of every selfish end, but also without entire knowledge of the matter in hand. The aim of the ploughing was nothing less than the casting down of the evil of injustice and public immorality which was enthroned in the world, which found its complete expression in unjust war, and whose most perfect incarnation was Russia.

His followers must not only *be*, they must *know*. To that end they must labour, to that end they must study. They must spare themselves no toil or trouble. He who said this practised what he preached. His labour was incessant.

"There is nothing in the whole world," he says, "equal in my eyes to one man being always perfect, always able to convict, always indignant against wrong, whose mind ever occupies the judgment seat, who, in a word, is—judgment. That God created us for this is evident in our being the reverse; for what pushes each into the mire is the desire to appear to be right, that disposition which we familiarly designate among ourselves as self-love. Now this is the sure effect of failing to *be* right. Such an aspiration planted in the breast of all (as well as the necessary faculties themselves) shows that being right is the end for which we were created. Here too lies the evidence of immortality revealed in man himself, the greatest of all revelations."

"Those only who see are honest. Those only can hope who work. Forget yourself. That is the first condition of good greatness and of real enjoyment."

If Urquhart had been asked to explain his moral point of departure he would doubtless have cited his extensive and sympathetic knowledge of the East. He went to Turkey from Greece, and was at first most unfavourably impressed respecting the character of Eastern countries by the Turkish Government and people.

It was after six years' work and experience that he felt forced to change his opinions. Obviously, though we may pass by for the moment the question of Turkish administration, he was qualified to form a judgment about Eastern life. It is the moral aspect of that judgment which affects us here. David Urquhart considered he had been convicted by a Mussulman of the crime of murder in unjust war, and that he had learnt from the Mussulmans the first principles, unknown in Europe, of cleanliness, courtesy, self-denial and sincere speech.

"If I take this musket unblessed by God, then I take it of the devil," said a simple Mussulman soldier, explaining why he and his companions had allowed themselves to be driven out of a redoubt, without firing a shot, by Russian soldiers. War had not been declared by the Fetva, therefore to fight would have been murder. A Christian might do such a thing, a Mussulman never. Urquhart, whose own hands were reddened with the blood of men with

whom his country was not at war (he had fought against the Turks in the Greek War of Independence), was brought up short against an overwhelming sense of guilt. "I would gladly have given myself up to justice," he says, "had there been a tribunal to deal with such cases." Instead thereof, he gave himself up to a lifelong struggle to re-establish the cause of law and justice between nation and nation.

This first lesson was followed by others, for it must be remembered that the Turkey he studied was not the Turkey of Constantinople, but the Turkey of the country villages unspoiled by European civilisation. The veil of European convention fell from his eyes. The mist of European language and ideas fell from his mind. He saw that there is something better than so-called progress, and that is "stationariness," when the latter means "the free right to property of every man, and the equality of all men before the law." When the *status quo* is good, man, especially the Eastern, mistrusts all departure from it. Again, if government in the East is despotism, it is frank despotism, not legal tyranny; "men are not exasperated by the conversion into law, through the decisions of an accidental and numerical majority, of opinions they repudiate." It was in the East that Urquhart learnt the effect of manner and words on character. He saw a country where all classes mixed together in closest relationship, without familiarity on the one side, without haughtiness on the other; where the master addressed his servant in terms of respect and affection without fear of loss of dignity, because a common rule of respect and courtesy, unquestioned and irrefragible, governed all intercourse. Children brought up under that régime were neither cowed nor unruly. They were treated with respect and yielded obedience. He saw social intercourse free from the idle chatter and flippancy of European society, because politeness forbade anyone to speak unless he had something to say, and because it was the height of bad manners to tell anyone what he already knew. He found cleanliness carried to a pitch unknown in Europe, for the bath, as among the Romans, really carried away

the impurities of the skin, and even the hands must be washed by clean water being poured over them. And, lastly, he saw a state of society where an excuse was the worst of bad form, where a man must either prove himself right or admit himself wrong. In short, as he said towards the end of his life, he found a state of society in which all the ceremonies of the Catholic Church in her most solemn act of worship are part of the daily life of the people: the ablutions, the prayer of the priest[1] when censing the Altar, the reverential posture of the ministers, not only towards God, but towards each other, and finally the ceremonial and ancient form of salutation given under the very eye of God made Man.

David Urquhart's contemporaries found his religious position very difficult to define. Like most other things about him, it seemed to most men a paradox. On the one hand, his code of ethics, at first sight, seems diametrically opposed to that which we are inclined to consider as distinctively Christian. There is hardly anything in it which we can recognise as humility, or dependence on God. The fate of nations, according to it, depends entirely on the conduct of those who compose them. National catastrophes are always the direct result of stupidity or wrong-doing—the wrong-doing of every individual in the nation. Man will profit if he does his task with wisdom, knowledge and diligence. Man will suffer for carelessness, ignorance and folly. Man's first duty is to be right.

On the other hand, Urquhart says that the only end of his existence is to serve God, which service consists in being just—that is, in having a right judgment in all things. In a letter to an unbeliever he declares:

"I am daily and hourly engaged in the endeavour to lead the life of a Christian—that is, to be right in all things. That 'all things' includes the minutest operation of the mind and perception of the senses."

He maintained that most so-called Christians were not Christians.

[1] Pone Domine custodiam ori meo . . . ut non declinet cor meum in verba malitiæ ad excusandas excusationes in peccatis.

"To know a Christian," he says, "there is the simplest of rules, which is also a Divine Commandment; it is 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' You must surely know that in this land there are no longer Christians, and without Christians how can there be Christianity? . . . If there were amongst the missionaries a single Christian, he would not be found in China or Hindoostan, but in England, denouncing a race of malefactors and calling them to repentance."

There can indeed be no doubt of the depth and absolute sincerity of his religious convictions. They are manifest in every action of his life. His religious history is a singular one. Brought up by a clever and original mother,[1] whose piety took the form of extreme Evangelicalism, his education threw him during the most impressionable time of his young life into contact with Catholics in foreign schools.

No strong impression seems, however, to have been made on him till he came under the influence of Cæsar Malan of Geneva. Under the spell of this famous Calvinistic teacher and his friends, the latent Calvinism Urquhart had inherited from his forbears burst forth in the youth of fifteen. He went about from village to village with Malan's "missionaries," denouncing the Catholic religion as anti-Christ, setting forth the Gospel, and "desiring nothing so much as to become one of that zealous band, who had given up all to spread the pure word of God in the dark places of the earth"—*i.e.*, in the Catholic Cantons of Switzerland! "Constance," he says, "is so much under the curse of God for the burning of John Huss that there is scarcely one Christian known of in the town!"

But even under this strong Calvinistic influence his natural instinct for right action comes out.

"How curious is fate," he wrote to his mother in 1820. "We cannot pass, I really believe, a thousandth part of a hand-breadth of our chain. Not that I think we are blindly

[1] Urquhart had been his mother's constant companion from infancy. Left a widow while he was still a young child, all her devotion was centred upon him. Her great desire was that he should gain a knowledge of men and things before "he went into abstruse studies," which she had observed "hardened the feelings and destroyed the heart."

to follow without consideration; we must make use of our judgment and do all for the best. That is our part, and things will only be blessed to us in so far as we act after these principles, but still our allotted part will be the unchangeable same. For the determination of the Almighty is unchangeable."

In order to break the Malan influence Mrs. Urquhart sent David to travel in Spain for six months with a tutor.

When the lad was close upon sixteen mother and son returned to England. Coming back to his native land must have been a new experience for young David, who had been abroad since his eleventh year.

We have little means of knowing how his inner self developed amidst the strenuous activities of his early manhood, which extended from engineering work as an operative at Woolwich Arsenal to farming operations. These works were evidently among the recreations of his vacations, for at sixteen he matriculated at St. John's College, Oxford. His career was interrupted by ill-health, which drove him to the South of France before he had completed his course. Instead of returning he embarked for Greece with Lord Cochrane, with whom his half-brother Charles was serving as a Naval Captain.

At the susceptible age of seventeen he began an intimate friendship with Jeremy Bentham, in whose affections from that time "our David," as he always calls him in writing to his mother, held a high place. That the old Sage appreciated fully his unusual mental endowments is evident in a letter answering one of Mrs. Urquhart's in 1830. "David has for years been better able to judge for himself than anyone at such a distance [he was then in Greece] can judge for him. The advice I submit to you is to leave the matter altogether to himself, accompanied with information of the utmost you are able to do or obtain for him in the way of money." In 1825 he had written a letter of introduction for him, beginning: "The bearer, David Urquhart, though rather too constitutionally born and bred, which he cannot help, poor fellow! is an intimate and most worthy friend of mine, in whom I have entire confidence."

Probably close friendship with the old utilitarian de-

veloped Urquhart's strong sense of the place of law in morality. Perhaps he unconsciously absorbed from him that belief in and dependence upon reason, that scornful contempt for stupidity or loose thought, that characterised him all his life. There was always about him a clear-cut hardness and a secure superiority which recall Bentham and his school.

His real spiritual awakening Urquhart dates from the rebuke given to him by the Mussulman soldier at a time when, "fortunately," he says, "I was young enough for the sense of shame not to be extinguished, and not having passed through the ordinary routine of education, nor having learnt to sneer at what is different to ourselves, . . . I found for the first time the perception of a human being." It is on the "perception of a human being" that David Urquhart afterwards takes his stand. "It is merely the natural law which makes men men and not beasts, that I ask you to observe," he says.

Her position as a great lawgiver and disciplinarian attracted him nearly all his life to the Catholic Church. But the attraction was on the intellectual side; no allowance is made for feeling.

This probably accounts for the curious sense of aridity with which, in spite of our admiration, Urquhart's life and writings so often inspire us. Even his wife, with her evangelical piety, did not dispel it.

To the end of his life Urquhart remained apparently aloof from human emotion, human passions, human weakness; the homely and comfortable things which surround other men's public work had no place in his. The gracious play of feeling, of sympathy, the delicate light and shade which make the lives of so many great men like pleasant green hills, down which the streams bubble, on which flocks feed and lambs play, and which shelter in their folds little dwellings, whose blue smoke rises into the blue heavens, seem to have no place in that life of stern austerity and unremitting work. Urquhart stood like a clean-cut rock, alone, inaccessible, unsmiling, unaffected by rain or sunshine, yet all the while bearing in nooks and crannies flowery treasures for those who knew where to look,

touching memories, unexpected tendernesses and sensitive affections. Little remarks here and there will show how the really human heart of the man suffered and loved. He and his wife were all in all to each other. "We are most happy," he writes, when nearly at the end of his life, to a friend in England, "and often wonder if there ever lived on earth two persons as happy as we are."

The people whom he admitted to his friendship had great power to hurt him. He could spend sleepless nights over the sorrows of a working-man friend whom he had not seen for twelve years.

"Do you think that I am destitute of human feelings," he writes to a friend, "that I could receive a letter with all those suppositions about myself from one to help whom in the discharge of his duty I have been labouring both by night and day, with any other feelings than those of great pain and extreme surprise ?"

As a child he was affectionate and sensitive to an almost inconceivable degree. A story is told that when he was still an infant in his nurse's arms, his father came in hurriedly and went out again without noticing him. The little David burst into a passion of grief which nearly cost him his life.

Nevertheless, David Urquhart, to most men of his time, stood strange, uncompromising, unadorned, the preacher of righteousness, that comes by the works of the law in an age which preferred to believe only in such righteousness as could be had without works. For those were the days when English statesmen could openly avow that International Law was no concern of theirs; they were the days when capitalists grew rich on the labour of babes, put to work as soon as they could totter, while Pharisees of the school of Hannah Moore were preaching to the poor their duty of submission and respect to their betters.

The love of International and National Justice was dead. The one had been slowly dying since the Peace of Westphalia, the other had received its death blow when, at the demolition of the monasteries, lands, which had kept many in contentment, were seized to enrich those whom the King delighted to honour.

And the nations were blindly content with this state of

things. To arouse them a seer was wanted. That seer David Urquhart undoubtedly was. But he was the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Like Jeremiah he stood and cried aloud to the inhabitants of Europe. He told them of their iniquities, of which they were filling up the measure. He told them of the woe that would come upon them: nothing short of a universal catastrophe which would involve the whole of Europe.

And who can say to-day that he was not a true prophet? "I see as clearly with the eye of the mind as others do with the eye of the body," he said. He belonged by birth to that mysterious race of the Celt which, for whatever reason, possesses psychic sight, from whom realities are wont to be hidden by the thinnest of veils. In Urquhart even that scarcely existed. The account he gives of his dream life shows how abnormally his sub-consciousness was developed.

"In my dreams," he says in a letter to a friend, "I am a being of a higher order than in my waking state, for I can not only imagine what is beyond my power to imagine when I am awake, but also can represent those imagined things to the senses as if real. I see the landscape and its colours, I see endless vistas of statues never seen with the waking eyes, and groves of bas-reliefs of the most exquisite beauty. I see the most intricate designs, endless, never the same, and as entirely original in conception as they are perfect in execution. They convey the most exquisite enjoyment, and to that extent, that when my waking eye takes in an object with pleasure, it seems but the faint reflection or memory of what I have enjoyed in sleep. That sleep existence is infinitely more intense than the waking one. I labour more, I never rest, I see more, understand more, enjoy more, and suffer more. I am the while causing myself to suffer, to enjoy, to understand, and all this in various persons at the same time. I can do things when asleep that I cannot do when awake. I can do that which when awake I can only appreciate. If, then, in another state I can accomplish what I cannot in this, there needs must be a faculty in the mind higher than its own powers of apprehension. It is in me all the time, only latent at some time, and that sometime is our normal state when awake."

This subconsciousness that worked constantly in his sleep worked unconsciously in his waking hours and made of David Urquhart a mystic. It is easy to recognise in his description of his dream state the mystical temperament. It showed itself in other ways, notably in his extraordinary perception of what was in man. In conversation with his friends he would startle them by answering aloud their thought rather than their speech. One very remarkable story is told of his supernatural power of discernment. A great friend was anxious to bring his son to see and be introduced to the great man. The meeting had been arranged with difficulty; Urquhart was in England only for a short time, for the incident took place towards the end of his life, when his permanent home was in Savoy. But the youth must not be deprived of an interview he would remember all his life. When the day came David Urquhart was in a somewhat suffering state, and was lying on the couch in his sitting-room at the hotel. The sofa was in such a position that the person entering could not at once see it, so that when the youth came into the room Urquhart could only see his hand opening the door. But that was enough for him. Quick as lightning he left his couch and darted into his bedroom, whence no persuasions or entreaties of his wife could withdraw him. "No," he said, "I will not see him; I will not be in the same room with that young man. The hand I saw is the hand of a criminal!" Not long after the youth brought himself within reach of the law for forgery.

Urquhart had that true and delicate perception of evil and strong (almost physical) loathing of it, which we are accustomed to associate with the Saints and mystics of the Catholic Church. Of such we hear how they faint in the presence of sin; how they can see into the heart of a sinner; how the sight of one venial sin is to them torment unspeakable. At first sight Urquhart seems to have little in common with a Catholic Saint. We look in vain for the shrinking from notice, the dependence on Divine help, the rapt states of prayer, the patience, meekness and outward humility that seem inseparable from the saintly character. But looking more closely there is more likeness

than appears at first sight. The unique sign of the saintly life is the crucifixion of self. "I die daily," says St. Paul. To kill self-love was the first step in Urquhart's training of his disciples. The entire abnegation of self was his own ideal. "Be ye therefore perfect," is the standard set before the Saint. "To be a Christian is to be right in all things," said Urquhart. But with him harshness towards himself was not joined with leniency towards others. He exacted from others what he exacted from himself. And there lies the secret both of his power and of his failure, his power with the few, his failure with the many. For it is only the few who are what Professor James calls the twice-born, and one of these was Urquhart himself. He had been born again and washed and made whole; he never returned to his wallowing in the mire. Having seen, like the souls of Plato's myth, one of the attributes of God, His eternal righteousness and justice, with the clear vision of the mystic, he could never again take man's counterfeits and call them righteousness and justice. Such to him were always base and evil, even the least noxious of them, and he counted them as sin, and to him there was no such thing as venial sin. Sin was always base and without excuse.

Had Urquhart had the full vision of the Saint, had he been beaten to the ground as St. Paul was in his journey to Damascus beneath the full rays of the Sun of Righteousness, he would have known the gentleness and patience, the almost infinite love and tenderness of the saintly soul. But hidden in a cleft of the rock he had seen but the skirt of God's garment of justice that covers the world and hides as well as reveals Him. Therefore he became a seer and a prophet; he missed being a saint. "I do not understand good," he says, "I only understand evil. I know I must resist sin in myself and evil in others." He saw this with his whole being, and he did it to the death.

But his idea of evil was very concrete. He would not allow that a man should accuse himself of cowardice, or avarice, or injustice in the abstract. That conduced to false humility and indolence. After all there is a comfort in labelling oneself and saying: "Well there it is; that is

what I am. What else can you expect of me but such things ?" But a man can be guilty of a coward act, of an unjust act, of an avaricious act. It is of these that he has to repent, and the proof of his repentance will be, Urquhart maintained, as in his own case, the impossibility of committing such an act again. It is so with all the brotherhood of the twice-born, and Urquhart knew no other.

" He (one of his disciples) said to me that he was cowardly and could not do this. I said to him: ' You are not cowardly, because there is no such thing as courage. It is not a thing —courage: it is merely the character of an act. The act has reference to the means of judging of the thing. If a man understands, he does that which is right to do, and he will therefore neither be courageous, nor will he be timid, and there will be no idea either of bravery or of cowardice. A man must err in act and err in judgment of that act, when he refers to the presence of cowardice for the deficiency of the performance of his duty. Not understanding what you have got to do, if you do less than, with such a knowledge as you do possess, you might effect; or, not understanding what you have to do, if you attempt more than you can accomplish you will have erred in both cases. And he who looks to the highest part of his own soul will think of that error. It is only he, who does not go to it but who hangs behind, who will speak of courage or cowardice. Not going to the source, not only will he not correct himself, but he will have his mind carried away from attention to those means by which he would correct himself, which was by better knowledge of the matter upon which he has to act, or a better arrangement of that mind by which he has to judge."

" To attribute character and tendencies to the mind, and to judge of the capacities of a man by them is," he goes on to say, " as if one found abstract ideas of the ills suffered by a man in sickness and tried thereby to remedy the disease. It is by this fatal habit that disease and decay go unchecked in men and nations, and such decay is, as a rule, only arrested by means of someone simple-minded and uninstructed."

Here speaks the age-long passion for reality of the twice-born, the getting at the thing which lies behind the abstractions which veil it from our crooked minds, the simple

and direct vision of one who knows, who remembers what he saw in the heavens.

In the same conversation Urquhart tells how he had himself once had to write down at the request of a phrenologist whom, with great reluctance, probably at the urgent request of his mother, he had consulted, what he considered to be his own mental and moral characteristics. He passed in review, he says, various qualifications and various deficiencies he thought he might possess, and in every instance that might prove the possession of such a quality or deficiency he found that they were all due to knowledge or ignorance of facts, of judgment, or misjudgment. And on the quality of judgment, on which all depended, he could not speak at all, because it was himself, and he could not see it because through that he saw other things. He was therefore reduced to presenting the phrenologist with a sheet of blank paper.

Self-examination was one of the first things that Urquhart taught his disciples, but it was their acts and omissions they were to examine. They were not allowed to take refuge from them in generalities. The religion of the ordinary religious person was, he declared, a mockery, because, instead of binding to his soul the commandments of God and fulfilling them in his public as well as in his private life, he hugged to himself generalities, among them the dangerous heresy that religion was an affair of a man's own soul and had nothing to do with politics or public affairs. It was by indulging in generalities that people could thank God for the conclusion of an unjust peace, that wealthy coal-owners could speak at meetings for the abolition of negro slavery, while little girls of four and five were working for more than twelve hours a day as trappers in their mines.

Anyone can see this now; how many people saw it when Urquhart denounced the Chinese War and declaimed against the social conditions of his day ?

A most vivid and illuminating description of Urquhart in the full tide of his power and work is contained in a letter by a still living writer. Her husband, a member of one of the great Polish families whose life was spent in

struggling for the freedom of his people, found in Urquhart a friend ever stanch and faithful to the cause of Poland.

The letter was written from London in 1862 to a friend in Poland.

" You have probably heard the name of Urquhart. That man is a phenomenon, and to have met him makes an epoch in one's life. I do not know how to express, for I do not understand myself the impression he has made upon me. I heard a lecture of his on the Law of Nations; he spoke for nearly three hours, and I was sorry when he had done. I think he did not hesitate once or repeat a single time the same thought. He was repeatedly interrupted and drawn into a new current of thought. These thoughts flowed again, and to an unobservant listener it would have seemed he had hardly time to collect or develop them. He followed them up in the same way as if he were ascending a flight of steps, straight before him, not turning right or left, but at each step disclosing new horizons. I said to myself: 'This man is a genius, but strange to say, for all that he is disagreeable.' He has stayed with us three days; it is the third time he has done so since we have been here. He left to-day. However strong is the feeling that I could hate him, I know there are wonderful depths in him and that there is something which God must have put in the heart of man at the beginning of the world, which our civilisation has destroyed and corrupted. He is as learned as a Lexicon; this is a help, but not his principal weapon. His strongest argument is 'justice,' or, rather, 'truth.' He says that all trouble and disquiet in this world originate in the confusions of the notions of right and wrong in every man's mind. That Russia is most to be blamed for this confusion. That formerly people did wrong, but there was a judgment upon them, that now no one has any independence of judgment. That Russia has corrupted and loosened politics and diplomacy in the whole world, and that, in consequence, anyone who wishes to serve truth is bound to wage war without mercy with her and with all that serves her views, whether consciously or unconsciously. This is why he got acquainted with my husband. He upbraids everyone with being untruthful, and when he begins to convince you of some prevarication or cowardice, or concession to wrong, or turning aside from the right path, such as bowing to the golden calf, or prejudice, etc., etc., without end, willingly or not one enters into one's

conscience and looks at it in a new light. And it is impossible to deny that he is in the right in many, many ways. He told me: ' Vous aviez un fond de caractère (I think he meant honesty) qui était une force mais qui est devenue, n'étant pas bien dirigée, un embarras, et ce qui vous était donné comme une force n'est qu'une faiblesse maintenant.' And he speaks in this way to everyone, when he does not say a thousand times stronger things. The shades of right and wrong which are very delicately pencilled in the very depths of one's soul and do not show at the surface ' il vous somme de les faire paraître.'

" But it is quite useless my trying to write about him, he is impossible to describe. He goes about like a comet with an immense tail of followers from every possible class of society, who believe in him as in the Gospel. And whoever is not with him is against him. He is called ' madman,' ' charlatan,' I know not what. He is known by everyone, but it is sufficient to name him in society here to be classed as a fool. You are laughed at in the face and asked, ' Oh, you are Urquhartite ? Very well !' But not only is one looked at as a fool, but also as a spy in the camp, for people are afraid of him. He brings to light and shows to the public view all the mean dealings and bribery of the English Ministers. He is ready to work night and day, to sacrifice health and property for the sake of Poland. He will thunder out to you, ' What is Poland to me ? Poland is nothing to me: it is justice that I am seeking and working for.' Someone asked him why he was friends with my husband. ' We are never of the same opinion,' he answered, ' but it is a man who has given up everything that is personal for the sake of what is right, and that is why I am his friend.' That Lord R. who is being sent to Berlin is his pupil, but does not equal his master by far; he is in love with him, though often disappointing. Mr. Urquhart says of him that for fear of his constituents he (Lord R.) dare not speak out or act as his conscience bids, and adds: ' I do not trust him for a moment; I have had to struggle with his ambition (in office), and now I have to struggle with his cowardice '; and that he says not only of him but to him.

" I do not know why I write all this, but I will have to meet him all along, and I cannot well write when you know nothing of the people we have to deal with. When his course of lectures come out I will send them to you; please read them with attention."

CHAPTER II

THE EAST AND THE WEST: URQUHART AT CONSTANTINOPLE

> "Still eyes look coldly upon me;
> Cold voices whisper and say—
> He is crazed with the spell of far Arabia,
> They have stolen his wits away."
>
> WALTER DE LA MARE.

URQUHART'S knowledge of the East, his love for the Turk and hatred of the Russian began with the Greek War of Independence.

After the Treaty of Adrianople,[1] though Capodistrias had offered him the command of a civil Province, he spent his time in studying the ancient Municipal Institutions, first in Greece and afterwards in Turkey. During a visit to Constantinople the knowledge of mineralogy which he acquired in vacation excursions from his private tutor at Oxford, Gerald Smith, brought him to the notice of the Sultan. This knowledge which had been to him a form of recreation stood him in good stead, for it introduced him to the Seraglio, and was the beginning of his subsequent and often intimate relationships with successive members of the Turkish Government.

Like M. Le Play, he applied the methods of scientific investigation to the study of the East.

Returning in 1830 to England through Albania, which had broken out into revolution, he published his observations in a series of articles in the *Courier*. They attracted the notice of William IV., who had already heard much of this brilliant youth through his private secretary, Sir Herbert Taylor, a lifelong friend of his mother.

It seemed as though Urquhart's career was made.

[1] See Biographical Sketch in the *Conversations Lexicon*.

In the year 1831 Sir Stratford Canning, Envoy Extraordinary to Constantinople, sent the young man, then only twenty-six, on a secret mission to Albania to induce the Grand Vizier, Reschid Mohammed Pasha, to renounce his intention of carrying the power of Albania against Greece, a measure which would probably have resulted in the complete subjugation of that country. Urquhart met Reschid Mohammed at Scodra, and was successful in his enterprise. His mission accomplished, he returned home through Wallachia, Moldavia, Austria and Germany, making observations all the way. He was much struck with the German Customs Union,[1] and seems to have seen at a glance the probable effects on English, indeed on European, commercial interests. More clearly still were his eyes opened to the deliberate hostility of Russia to European development. With these ideas in his mind he determined to travel through Europe and Asia, and to make far-reaching observations as to the political and commercial conditions prevailing in the countries most exposed to Russian influences.

His plan involved a journey through Prussia and Austria down the Danube to Trebizond, through Persia and Central Asia, and finally through Tartary to China.

Through his friends at Court, Urquhart succeeded in commending his scheme to the Secretary of the Board of Trade, and was sent out again with a practically free hand to make commercial investigations in Europe and Asia.

But arriving in Turkey he was struck with the growing hostility of the Sublime Porte to England—due, as he believed he had discovered, largely to Russian machinations. He renounced, therefore, for the present, his plan of proceeding to the Far East and settled down in Turkey, determined to bring about as good an understanding between the Ottoman Empire and his own country as existed between himself and the Sultan.

To this end he made himself as a Turk. He lived in a Turkish house, surrounded himself with Turks, both as

[1] He published his impressions on the probable effect of that Union in an article in the *British and Foreign Review*, Oct. 1835.

servants and as friends, became complete master of the language, and rose so high in the esteem of his adopted countrymen that they treated him in all respects as one of themselves, even to giving him the Turkish Temena or salutation, which as a rule they bestow upon none but the sons of the Prophet.

One result of the long residence in the East was the Turkish Commercial Treaty which he drew up and submitted to both the English and Turkish Governments.

Diplomatist as he was by choice, he saw in commerce the firmest bond for the union of Peoples, as well as one of the most powerful weapons for world dominion in the hands of an unscrupulous Government. In a close commercial union with Turkey there was, he maintained, not only the possibility of a vast increase of trade with England, but a most effectual means of combating that insidious method of conquest by diplomacy and trade whereby Russia was enlarging her borders and increasing her sphere of influence.

In 1833 he published *Turkey and her Resources*, an epoch-making work in the history of the Eastern Question.[1] The *Conversations Lexicon* speaks of it as "one of the most surprising productions in literature," and there is no doubt that the amount of fresh knowledge brought by it within reach of Europeans, and the originality of its conclusions turned the thoughts of many of the thinkers

[1] Urquhart's "Turkey" has never been approached, far less superseded.

Sir William White, the British Ambassador in Constantinople from 1885 to 1891, was wont to say that no one could pretend to know the East who did not know his "Urquhart"; and to this day those who have attained to anything beyond a superficial knowledge of the baffling intricacies of the Eastern Question echo his words.

Sir William White's opinion is, from his first-hand knowledge of the East, of great value. Indeed, so far was that knowledge and experience beyond that of any of his contemporaries in the Diplomatic Service, that, notwithstanding his having been a mere consul, and in spite of his faith (he was a Catholic, and there had been no Ambassador of that religion since the Reformation), the Government could not avoid sending him as Ambassador to Constantinople. His policy was to build up the Balkan States as a bulwark against Russia.

Sir William White furnished the rare—perhaps, in Constantinople, the unique—example of an Ambassador whose appointment was due solely to his being a skilled and honest diplomatist.

among politicians towards the hitherto much misunderstood East. The entire falsity of European ideas on the whole Eastern Question was one which Urquhart never ceased to impress on statesmen.

In 1834 he published his pamphlet *England and Russia*, which he sent to the Duke of Wellington with a letter[1] pointing out that the whole treatment of Turkey had been systematically calculated to throw her, where of herself she never wished to be, into the arms of Russia, that England's neglect had been the opportunity of the Power which made use of any and every means for gaining influence and control. "Her agents," he said, "speak the language, have access to every office, and to the intimacy of the Sultan. Their opportunities are seized for the propagation of opinions which, being reiterated day by day without contradiction, are more or less believed, and are so far accepted as to have introduced into the Government a feeling on foreign politics . . . that no reliance can be placed on her promises, that the power of England is verging to its decline, that Russia is about to upset its dominion in India, that the power and resources of the Russian Government are unlimited, save by the moderation of the Emperor." He pointed out how ready the mass of the Turkish people were to believe the contrary of "this, to them, afflicting picture." "I have," he says, "been within the last year on the Western and Eastern frontiers of Turkey, and I can bear witness to the universality of the hopes that to my utter amazement I found placed in England by every tribe and in every hamlet."

Urquhart saw and never tired of saying that Turkey with her teeming soil ought to be England's market. He also saw, and said it to the constant discomfiture of the English Government and of the Russian merchants, that Russia was working to shut her out of that market. He pointed not only to the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, but to the blockade of the free and independent state of Circassia by Russia and to the newly created provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia which she was trying to get into her net.

[1] Foreign Office Papers, 266.

It was not only Urquhart who was alive to this attitude of Russia. The British Consul at Belgrade wrote in 1838 to Her Majesty's Government that the Russian Agent was insistent in his demands on Prince Milosch of Servia to give no credence to the assurances of any English Agent as regards the settlement of the Servian Question at Constantinople if he wished for Russia's friendship and protection. But Prince Milosch replied that "he should choose his own friends," and the Consul earnestly impressed on Lord Palmerston that "if Her Majesty's Government should abandon the interests of Servia and expose Prince Milosch to the vengeance which awaits him at the hands of Russia, British influence would cease throughout European Turkey, and all future assurances of Her Majesty's Government would be received with suspicion."[1]

It was Urquhart's great anxiety about the establishment of right relations between Britain and the East that led him to ask for an official post in the Embassy at Constantinople, where he hoped that his friendship with Lord Ponsonby, the Ambassador, on the one hand, and with the Sultan and his ministers on the other, would enable him to attain his object. In 1836, thanks to the offices of the old sailor King, William IV., who had a warm place in his heart for the young officer of his own Service,[2] Palmerston found himself obliged, evidently with great reluctance, to appoint Urquhart to the Embassy of Constantinople as First Secretary. Having given him the post he was extremely anxious to get him safely out of London, but Urquhart declined to move until he had obtained certain concessions from the English Government, which would make his work possible and his post not a sinecure.

These were: an immediate increase in the Navy, a closer connection with France against Russia, the re-establishment of friendly relations between Persia and Turkey, the abolition of the system of Dragomans in Constantinople and the conclusion of three Commercial Treaties, one between England and Turkey, which was, as it seemed, practically

[1] Foreign Office Papers, 266, Oct. 10, 1838.
[2] Urquhart had a Lieutenant's Commission under Lord Cochrane.

settled; another between England and Persia, to place a limit on Russian influence in the East, and another between England and Austria, which was practically a defensive alliance against Russia in the West.

Of these points, two, the increase of the Navy and the Commercial Treaty with Turkey, were conceded without difficulty. The Navy increase took place almost at once, thanks to the support of William IV. Of the other points none was refused; the question of the Dragomans, which seemed to Urquhart most important, for he declared the English Dragoman was brother to the Russian, was promised careful consideration, as were also the Treaties with Persia and Austria.

It seemed as though anything was possible to a young man who could so obtain the confidence of two Governments before he was thirty, and Urquhart departed to his post at Constantinople full of hope.

Never was there a more disastrous ending to an undertaking which promised so well.

Urquhart's short diplomatic career was a conspicuous failure. That the failure was in some measure attributable to himself there is little doubt. He had obviously no idea that it was part of his duty to fulfil the conventional functions of a Secretary of Embassy. Instead of sedulously attending ambassadorial functions, attired as a Secretary of Embassy should be attired, and ready to enliven them with the brilliant conversation in which he was a past master, he retired with a friend to a cottage near the Embassy, where he spent his time in conversing with Turks, in study and in writing. Only four times in two months did he appear at the Ambassador's dinner-table. "The English mission" was singularly and collectively shocked at finding one of its official representatives adopting Turkish dress and Turkish habits, and eating Turkish food in the Turkish manner.

What a blow to the English prestige in Constantinople!

What an unpardonable lowering of the flag of English superiority in the face of the Heathen![1]

[1] See Foreign Office Papers, 309, 78. Memorandum by Mr. Frazer, on the differences between Lord Ponsonby and Mr. Urquhart, July 27, 1837.

Far more serious, however, than the social stigma which he brought upon himself was the attitude which Lord Ponsonby adopted towards the young diplomatist with whom he had previously been on the most friendly and even affectionate terms.[1] When Urquhart arrived in

[1] The correspondence found among Urquhart's private letters between himself and Lord Ponsonby, during his visit to England in 1835–36, is like the correspondence between an affectionate and intimate father and son.

The following account of his position in Turkey, however, from a MSS. Life found among his papers, is enough to show that even if it is here exaggerated, his position as a Secretary to Embassy was quite incompatible with it.

The writer was a barrister, a friend of Urquhart's, and the account is a conversation that he had with a Greek commercial agent, who had known Urquhart during his sojourn in Turkey.

"*Mr. Lovi (the Agent):* 'The first thing he did was to adopt the dress and customs as near as possible, and, knowing the customs so perfectly, he used to go into Turkish houses, and was received the same as a Turk, taking care never to infringe upon the Turkish customs, that is to say, always leaving the shoes at the door, and other things of that kind. . . . The consequence was that he was courted by all the great men; so much so that even the Pashas would come and beg him to introduce them to one another! . . . He gained so much ground, that a general order was given in all the forts and fortresses that whenever he came a guard was turned out, and he was received as if he had been a Field-Marshal. . . . Lord and Lady Ponsonby dined with Mr. Urquhart to see the Turkish mode of living.'

"*Mr. Westmacott:* 'In fact, Lord Ponsonby gained his knowledge of the East, and of Turkish manners, from what he observed in Mr. Urquhart's house?'

"*Mr. Lovi:* 'Exactly. . . . There is a kind of officer sent by the Government to see that there is no riot. He was stationed in the Hall of the Palace. When the Ambassador would pass through he would take no notice, but if Mr. Urquhart came he jumped up in a moment; and this because a Turk holds himself superior to any Frank. The lowest Turk will never get up to receive any Frank. Mr. Urquhart was always received as one of themselves, and with even a great deal more respect. . . . On Mr. Urquhart's departure after a visit to Mustapha Pasha, he turned out his body-guard and lined the streets down to Mr. Urquhart's house. He could not have done more if it had been the Sultan. . . . The Ministers were always very much afraid that the Russians would get to know that he (Mr. Urquhart) communicated with them—I know that Achmet Pasha used to send his boat generally at midnight for him to avoid observation. . . . When he went away to England the impression was that he was coming back as Ambassador; that Lord Ponsonby intended to resign and that Mr. Urquhart was to take his place. They look to him as the regenerator of Turkey up to the present day.'"

With such a position as this at his feet in Turkey, with the con-

Constantinople in July, 1836, as Secretary, it was to find his relations with the Ambassador suddenly and entirely changed: the archives of the Embassy were closed to him, his work was thwarted, and his person treated with contempt, contempt that increased with the lapse of time, until at last Lord Ponsonby refused to acknowledge his official existence or to communicate with him except through the Dragoman Pisani. No greater insult could have been put upon him, for Urquhart had always protested against the presence of the Dragomans at the Embassy, and had refused to employ them as intermediaries. He felt this treatment so acutely that his health suffered, and the only way in which he could endure it was to withdraw himself to a Turkish village and there carry on that intercourse with the Turks which he had found impossible in Constantinople.

Meanwhile the estrangement between the Ambassador and the First Secretary was common talk.

Urquhart himself in after years refused to believe that Lord Ponsonby was really responsible for his incomprehensible behaviour.[1] He attributed it to the deliberate

fidence of the King in England, with his great knowledge of the possibilities and resources of the East, and his full conviction of what we are just beginning to discover, the rottenness of the so-called civilisation of the West, what a martyrdom must Urquhart have suffered, when at 30 years old the gate to the way of usefulness both to Turkey and his own country was suddenly shut upon him by the suspicion and dislike of one man, and he was bidden, so far as the Government service was concerned, to eat out his heart in silence and inaction!

[1] Mrs. Urquhart, in a letter written shortly before Lord Ponsonby's death, in 1855, gives a very touching account of the resumption of their relations. "Yesterday," she says, "we went to Brighton by appointment to call on Lord and Lady Ponsonby. He was the Ambassador at Constantinople under whom David served when he was Secretary of Embassy there. Since then, the year 1837, they have never met. You have heard of David's being recalled at that time. Some months ago Lord Ponsonby said with much emotion in the presence of two or three friends of D.'s: 'He is the most generous of men. I ruined him and he has never spoken a word against me.' At the same time he bore testimony to his accurate judgment and his wonderful power of action.

"But now I have heard with my own ears what he thinks of my husband. He has been very ill, and he said something to me of his invalid state. I replied that we never wanted him so much as now. On which he turned to David, and said, 'There is the man. He has

misrepresentations made to the Ambassador by Lord Palmerston, who was afraid of Urquhart's anti-Russian policy, and had adopted the plan of making him harmless by blighting at once and for ever his diplomatic career in lieu of the more direct means which he would have adopted had it not been for the King's affection for the young diplomatist.

At the same time it must be admitted that Urquhart at large amongst the conflicting interests and inflammable materials of Constantinople was "like a fire-ship let loose in the Bosphorus." With his versatile genius, his extraordinary knowledge, his private friendship for the Sultan, his great influence in the Turkish Government, he stood forth the most conspicuous figure in Constantinople. It began to be whispered abroad that he had come out entrusted with special powers from the English Government, which were to supersede those of ordinary diplomatists. Everyone knew that he was responsible for the Commercial Treaty, from which such great things were hoped, and he was respected accordingly. It was of no avail that he withdrew into obscurity during the first weeks of his return to Constantinople, and ran the risk of offending many of his most influential Turkish friends by refusing to see them. "Daoud Bey" was in everyone's eyes, and his name on

been at work since the beginning, and has been always right. He has never failed to point out both the wrong done and what ought to have been done.' More than once he returned to the subject, and expressed the most complete concurrence with him. He can think of nothing but the state of the country, which he believes to be desperate. He said he had too good reason to know that the upper classes are fearfully worthless, and believes that the only hope of safety is in some one man being found fit to rescue the State as Dictator.

"But what we were able to tell him of the work going on in the North gave him new conceptions of what might still be done.

"I am sure he lay down easier in his bed that night, not only from the evident gratification of seeing David, but also from what we told him. He is a magnificent old man, just 84 he told me. I have never been in the presence of any one like him. I fear he does not leave one like him behind. There is no trace in others of such scorn and disgust for wickedness or wrong, or that same feeling for his country that a man has for what is most dear to him.

"David and he will henceforth take counsel together for England, as of old they did for Turkey."

everyone's lips, and doubtless the Ambassador heard from all quarters what great things he was to do. He would not have been human had such a state of things been pleasing to him. Matters were not improved by indiscretions of one of Urquhart's friends who, in letters to English papers, combined strictures on the effete methods of the Embassy with admiration for Urquhart's knowledge and talents.

Moreover, it must be admitted that neither then nor at any other time of his life did Urquhart shine in a subordinate position. Before he went out to Constantinople he wrote with all the air of a plenipotentiary to Backhouse, the Permanent Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs: "I saw the Turkish Ambassador in Paris, and conferred with him on the possibility of obtaining Firmans from the Porte for the passage of an English line of battleship through the Dardanelles." Backhouse was left gasping, and Lord Palmerston sent the following very justifiable snub: "Mr. Urquhart must learn to submit himself to the discipline of the Service to which he belongs. A private person may act on his own impulse, but a Commissioned Officer must wait till he is told to act. . . . This is a very important point, and unless Mr. Urquhart fully comprehends this principle of duty, and is prepared to attend to it, I should think it highly inconvenient for the Public Service that he should go to Constantinople. For the reason above stated I must desire that Mr. Urquhart be apprised that I highly disapprove of his having held communication upon Public Matters with the Turkish Ambassador at Paris without having been instructed or authorised by me to do so."[1]

Mr. Urquhart took the rebuke in a proper and submissive spirit. It is, however, scarcely likely that this was the only occasion on which he exceeded the very limited powers of a Secretary of Embassy. It is as easy to imagine Pegasus meekly submitting to be harnessed to the carriage which took the Ambassador for his daily airing as David Urquhart patiently trotting along in the appointed routine of a Secretary of Embassy in early Victorian days.

It is not, therefore, surprising that his diplomatic career

[1] Foreign Office Papers, 307.

came to an untimely end, under circumstances which precluded any hopes of its resumption. In March, 1837, he was recalled and his papers cancelled, Lord Palmerston refusing to give any reason beyond that of his open disagreement with the Ambassador. There is, however, one circumstance in particular that serves to confirm Urquhart's idea that his removal was due to Russian influence in the English Cabinet, and that is, the confiscation by a Russian warship of the merchant ship *Vixen*, sent through his agency to the coast of Circassia, and the acquiescence by Lord Palmerston in Russia's refusal to pay any compensation to her owners.

The story of David Urquhart's dealings with Circassia is one of the most romantic episodes in his life. He was the first Englishman to land on her shores, and on his visit he went there quite alone. The beauty and splendid physique of those mountain tribes, living a simple, primitive life, rich in noble tradition and in rare and fine craftsmanship, impressed him, no less than his intellect, the fire of his energy and his unique and fascinating personality attracted them. They begged him to become their chief and to lead them, in council as in war, against the Russians, who, by wile and cruelty were depopulating their country and stealing their territory. He refused, thinking to serve them better in his own country, and even though he failed in his aim, the Circassians never lost faith in him. Twenty years later, in the supreme hour of their country's last agony, they sent three of their chiefs to England, hoping still in the power and influence of "Daoud Bey" and the great nation in which they still believed because it was his.

All Urquhart's chivalry was engaged on behalf of these patriarchal tribes of the Caucasus, who, possessing a country but the size of Scotland, had yet successfully resisted the "million bayonets" which Russia declared Providence had entrusted to her. "Russia," said Urquhart, "has never been able to conquer the Circassians of the Black Sea. Still in sight of the Russian fishers of Anapa peasant girls tend their flocks, and warriors meet in the open air in solemn deliberation. No title could be obtained by con-

quest. No other State had ever possessed Circassia. Circassia, therefore, could never be obtained by cession. The device hit upon in this difficulty was simple. Russia ceded Circassia, which she did not possess, to Turkey, in order that a few years later she might compel Turkey, which in like manner did not possess it, to cede it to Russia."

This cession took place under the Treaty of Adrianople. Russia henceforth set to work to subdue the Caucasus, which was an effectual bar to her progress in the East. In 1831 she instituted what was practically a blockade of the Circassian coast, under pretext of plague quarantine, prohibiting trade with any place, except two stations where she had custom-houses.

Such was the position when Urquhart visited Circassia in 1834. His indignation was aroused at the injustice done to this small nation, while England, the defender of the oppressed, looked on unmoved. Lord Ponsonby was entirely in sympathy with him. "Your visit has been the occasion of great emotions," he wrote in September, 1834. "I think it is important that the Government should be put in ample possession of the political state of the Circassian nations without any delay. Will you draw up a memoir on the subject? I will send it in a despatch. It is right that you should receive the credit due to the exposition of the facts, which have been hitherto only generally and superficially known. . . . If we do not take care, Russia will possess the Caucasus and all the power which that possession will give her over Turkey and Persia."

In November, 1834, the Ambassador wrote to Lord Palmerston:

Lord Ponsonby to Lord Palmerston re *Circassia and Mr. David Urquhart.*

THERAPIA,
Nov. 24, 1834.

MY DEAR PALMERSTON,

I have a few words to say in reply to your letter of the 10th, wherein you express some alarm respecting Urquhart's conduct towards the Circassians. It is evident to me that you have not attended to the facts, and I feel confident you will be quite at your ease when you have

examined them. . . . The Circassians could not be *excited* to revolt, because they were at the time, and had long been, in arms against Russia, and had just defeated the Russian corps. There are 4 or 6 millions of people determined not to be transferred like herds of swine to the Russians, but resolved to assert their rights and liberty. I do not know the Englishman alive who would not, when asked, have given advice to such people how to act to render legitimate their virtuous, noble, and just resistance to a yoke which Russia has no right to impose upon them.

Urquhart counselled those who sought counsel from him to assert their right to independence by the declaration that they were not the subjects of Russia, had never been so, and would not be so. All of which was comprised in the declaration of their national independence, and which, if maintained *de facto*, would be esteemed by many (the Americans to wit) as sufficient ground for our acknowledgment, which in the case of South America was by ourselves held to be sufficient ground for treating with that country, and which, in the older case of North America, authorised France to acknowledge that country. Urquhart is not a diplomatic agent of His Majesty's Government.[1] He has no character whatever as a public servant. He, I believe, has been employed merely to collect what may be called statistical information. His words nor his acts could not implicate Her Majesty's Government, and lastly, it is wholly a secret to everybody that he is employed at all by the British Government.

Now, in addition to the above, I have to add that I learned from Capt. Lyon, who accompanied Mr. U., that so far from urging on the Circassians to encounter risks, he said the strongest things possible when replying to their questions, to persuade them to act with caution and the most careful attention to consequences dangerous to themselves from their isolated and destitute situation, and the hopelessness and improbability of their receiving aid from any foreign Power.

I have said this much in part from a feeling of what is just, in part from a feeling generated in my bosom by the thing itself.

I leave to Urquhart the proofs of the facts.

Believe me,
(Signed) PONSONBY.[2]

[1] He was on a secret commercial mission tour.
[2] Foreign Office Papers, 266.

David Urquhart's championship of Circassia was, however, by no means favourably regarded at home, and the Ambassador received letters requiring the removal from Constantinople of the "gentleman who had visited Circassia," because he was "endangering the peace of Europe." "What can I say," wrote Lord Ponsonby to Urquhart, referring to these letters, "but that curs will bark and rogues lie and fools believe, and time show the cowardice of the one, the falsehood of the other, and vary the folly of the last."

Since Urquhart had a friend at home in the person of William IV. as well as one at that time in Constantinople in the person of the Ambassador, it was two years before his enemies could get rid of the man who was "endangering the peace of Europe." They, however, succeeded in preventing any action by England in defence of Circassia. The coast of Circassia continued to be blockaded by Russia and all trade with her stopped.

Urquhart adopted another plan. In 1836, in order to assert the commercial right of England to trade with Circassia, he induced his friends the Bells, a firm of English merchants with a commercial house in Constantinople, to fit out a small ship laden with salt for a voyage to the Circassian coast. The vessel reached its destination and was for two days in trade with the inhabitants, when a Russian warship entered the harbour and seized her on the pretext of a breach of blockade. Redress was demanded by the owners from the British Government, and Lord Palmerston entered into correspondence with the Russian Government, who, in a high-handed manner, justified her action on the ground, not of blockade, but that the port where the vessel lay was Russian territory. This was absolutely no justification, because if it had been so, which it was not, there was a Commercial Treaty between England and Russia, and England had a right to trade with Russian ports. But Lord Palmerston, who had purposely postponed the whole matter till the Session of Parliament was at an end, pretended to accept it; the owners of the *Vixen* received no compensation for their

loss, and were ruined in consequence. William IV. was now dead, and Urquhart was at the mercy of Palmerston, who made this affair one of the causes of complaint against him when pressed hard for reasons for his dismissal, and refused to allow him any opportunity to justify his action. When the question was brought by Sir Stratford Canning before the House, Palmerston refused to read the letter which Urquhart had written to him in his defence, saying it was a lengthy tissue of mis-statements and misrepresentations, which he had not had the time to answer, and indeed had not properly read.[1]

So ended Urquhart's short and stormy diplomatic career. He had flashed like a meteor through the Foreign Office, seriously disturbing its peace, and no doubt the officials, permanent or otherwise, sighed with relief when he had gone.

Successive Governments, however, discovered to their cost that Urquhart at large was a more disturbing element than Urquhart bound by the slight trammels of the Diplomatic Service. In July, 1838, the Turkish Treaty came out.

"This treaty," says Mr. Urquhart in a letter to *The Times*, "was originally a suggestion of my own to the Turkish Government. Adopted by it, it was in the first instance rejected by the English Government, and after a year of truly laborious efforts it was finally admitted. The object of the treaty was so to lower the export and import tariff on Turkish goods, particularly those in which she came into competition with Russia, as to increase considerably Turkey's trade and cheapen England's commodities, notably corn and oil and raw silk. In the original draft the duty was three per cent. on both exports and imports, and transport duty and harbour duty were not to raise it above five per cent."

When the treaty finally came out, however, though Palmerston maintained that it was the same which Urquhart had drafted, a few adroit additions had so altered it as to destroy any possibility of Turkey's being able to compete

[1] See Parliamentary Papers relating to the seizure and confiscation of the *Vixen* by the Russian Government, presented to both Houses of Parliament, 1837.

with Russia in trade with Britain. British commerce was, in fact, charged with an additional duty of two per cent. import and nine per cent. export, an aggregate duty nominally of eleven per cent., which was in reality augmented to seventeen per cent. above the rate paid by Russian commerce, and Britain was excluded from equality of rights with Russia.[1]

[1] Treaty of Commerce with Turkey, 1838.

The following account of the negotiation of the Treaty of Commerce recently concluded with Turkey is given by "a Levant Merchant," in a letter to the editor of *The Times*, who acknowledges the respectability and extensive knowledge of the writer: In 1834, Mr. Urquhart, being then in Constantinople, was called upon by one of the ministers of the Sultan to give his advice upon a question of internal administration connected with the duties on import and export commerce, on which occasion he suggested to the Turkish Government that they should propose to Great Britain a new treaty of commerce, based upon precisely those principles which are contained in the one lately signed. Obstacles were at first raised, but after much discussion, his views prevailed, and he was requested to be the mediator between the two Governments for the negotiation of the matter. He consulted various British merchants in Constantinople on the subject, in order to hear their opinions, but, so far from viewing it as they now do, their perceptions were so darkened by prejudice in favour of the old system of things, and fear, perhaps, lest any change might render commerce more easy for new-comers, that, with hardly an exception, they condemned the project as dangerous, impossible and absurd. However, strong in his own convictions, Mr. Urquhart came to London, followed by a Turkish Ambassador, who was to support his project, and whom I then often heard express his coincidence in Mr. Urquhart's views. Overtures were made to the Foreign Office, but for a long time total apathy and apparent or pretended ignorance of the value of the proposition closed the door to all progress, until in the autumn and winter of 1835 the matter began to be attended to, entirely through the influence of his late Majesty, who saw the true value of Mr. Urquhart's views with regard to Turkey, and commanded that they should be carefully discussed. Mr. Urquhart was appointed Secretary of Embassy at Constantinople; the question of the treaty was regularly brought before the members of the Cabinet, and was the subject of discussion for several weeks. Lord Palmerston showed little disposition to adopt the new and remarkable views of one whom he considered a junior and a novice in diplomacy, and he handed the matter over to the President of the Board of Trade for examination. He at first declared, verbally and in writing, that the scheme was the production of a master mind, but by and by light broke in upon him, as he saw that if it was carried out in the manner that was projected, his family interests in the Baltic trade must be irretrievably damaged by Turkey being elevated to the position of a competitor in the supply of those articles which Russia alone furnishes to this country, for I well remember remarking, while in conversation with him at that

Urquhart was not slow to point out the difference between the original treaty and this one finally produced. He

time, the bias of his observations on this subject. Being among the number of those Levant merchants whose opinions were asked, and differing, as I did, from others who desired the continuance of the monopolies in Turkish commerce, I saw much of the ministerial manœuvres, which for a time prevailed. Lord Palmerston and Mr. Poulett Thomson then spoke of Mr. Urquhart's treaty and opinions as mere Utopian chimeras, and the subordinate officers, who had become their advocates from conviction, received hints to keep quiet. At length our late noble-minded Monarch, having heard of what was going on, and despising the paltry chicanery which he saw was standing opposed to the advancement of the true interests of his people, took one of those noble stands which he knew so properly how to assume when duty called upon him, and I dare the Government scribes to deny (what I knew at that time through the medium of more than one inmate of the Palace) that the option given to Lord Palmerston and Mr. Poulett Thomson was the adoption of the present much-lauded treaty *or their dismissal from office*, and that matters hung in the balance, those ministers being more out of than in office for two or three days on this very account. But place and pension were dear things to part with; the affront was pocketed, revenge was set aside for another day, and the treaty was adopted in the spring of 1836. All things then went on apparently very smoothly, although I must say that, knowing all I did of the preceding events, I had many suspicions as to the future conduct of these men in this matter. They soon after embarked Lord Ponsonby in their boat, evidently by showing him that if the treaty (having been projected by Mr. Urquhart) were concluded with the Turkish Government while he was at Constantinople, the credit would be given to him (Mr. Urquhart), and *pro tanto* not to his lordship. A misunderstanding between his lordship and Mr. Urquhart (who had, as I know, been for long previously on terms of the most intimate friendship with him) was raised and fostered. Lord Ponsonby then expressed his opinion openly in Constantinople that the draught of the treaty sent from London was a piece of monstrous absurdity which never could be carried into effect, and he accordingly set to work to prevent its being even proposed to the Turkish Government. The extraordinary correspondence published in your paper some months ago disclosed this and other disgraceful proceedings, for it is evident that Mr. Urquhart was sent to Constantinople with the predetermination of the Foreign Secretary to destroy his character in public life by leading him on to encourage the voyage of the *Vixen*, which in due season was to be disavowed, as contrary to the wish of his superiors, and by placing him in apparent opposition to his chief. When these disclosures came before the public, the existence of the treaty as a measure in abeyance became known; its conclusion was, of course, looked for with some expectation by mercantile men; but all the influence with the Porte which was requisite for that purpose was by that time absorbed by Russia, until at last Redschid Pasha (the most able Turkish minister that has filled the office of Reis Effendi for many years), aware of the deep importance of the treaty as a measure of salvation for his

published the two in parallel columns, and so evident to the commercial world was the superiority of the original draft, that he gained the confidence of many important men of the mercantile class who had already been attracted to him by his books and pamphlets and by the articles which for six months continuously he had contributed to *The Times*, showing an amazing grasp of wide-reaching commercial questions and a most original way of dealing with them. Through George Bell, of *Vixen* renown, he got a hearing at Glasgow, and was invited by the merchants to a large public dinner. His after-dinner speech, which lasted two hours, finished the work. "Henceforth," says one of his friends, "he may pursue as an amusement the career of gaining towns, which I presume to be no less interesting than instructive an occupation, and will come to tell powerfully on our national position."

Glasgow having fallen, the next town to be taken was Newcastle. Hull, Sheffield, Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham followed in quick succession. Everywhere Urquhart struck a new note—that international justice and commercial prosperity must go together.[1]

"Why," said he, "are half the markets which were open to British trade now closed? Because we, the champion of the oppressed, have allowed injustice to be done and cared naught. We had an open market in Poland. Our goods are now taxed sixty per cent. because, by our supine and criminal disregard of the Law of Nations, we have allowed her to be crushed out of existence. We have cut ourselves off from free commerce with Turkey by sacrificing her to Russia's aggression. We have almost

---

country, obtained the consent of the Sultan to adopt it, through despite of the opposition of the *interim* Russian minister, Baron Ruckman, and of the apathy of Lord Ponsonby, who had repeatedly declared that it would not and could not be adopted by the Turkish Government, and therefore left it neglected.

[1] The connection between Commerce and International relations is a familiar one in these days. It was new to the world when Urquhart insisted upon it.

In September, 1853, he published in the *Morning Herald* an article on "Diplomacy injurious to Trade," in which he gave a table showing the approximate loss to England in cash alone, not to speak of credit and influence, by her neglect of such treaties.

ruined our leather trade by allowing the blockade of Mexico by France in time of peace, an infraction of maritime law which we, the British Nation, who are the guardians of the Freedom of the Seas, should have maintained at all costs."

"The power of England," he said in his Glasgow speech, "does not reside in her bayonets, and is not shadowed by her pennants; it resides in the confidence which men have placed in her firmness and integrity. Her supremacy can only be endangered by the conquests of independent States, and aggression but rallies strength around her as the defender of endangered nationalities. When she proclaims herself the lover of peace at the expense of honour, when she asserts herself the friend of the powerful and the ally of the aggressor, she ceases to have a situation among mankind, not because her fleets are disarmed, but because her character has sunk.

"My idea of the power of England has not been derived from the inspection of her dockyards, or of any of her barracks, but from the veneration with which her name is pronounced on the Atlas, on the glaciers of the Alps, on the heights of Pindus, and in the vales of the Caucasus, on the plains of Poland, and the steppes of Astrakan."

Such speeches as this put Urquhart at once in opposition to the policy of "peace and retrenchment" of the Whigs, which was, as he very truly said, making the name of England a by-word among the nations who had once revered her, and justified the merchants in claiming him as a Conservative. The idea of a man who neither belonged nor wished to belong to any political party never entered their minds. He must enter Parliament in the Conservative interest, said his friends. Robert Monteith of Carstairs,[1] who was about to contest Glasgow, offered to retire in his favour. Sir George Sinclair, the Governor of the Bank of England, Sir Francis Burdett[2] and Mr. Somerset Beaumont would back

[1] A son of the Monteith who had welcomed Sir Robert Peel to Glasgow, a member of the Cambridge "Apostles," and David Urquhart's lifelong friend.

[2] Sir Francis Burdett was himself ever the sturdiest of fighters. To him "was confessedly due the merit of making free speech again possible in England."

As a member of the House of Commons he indicted the Govern-

him up if he would stand for Marylebone. Sheffield was open to him. The little coterie of devoted friends, who were faithful to him amidst many trials and, in spite of much that would have killed friendship for a lesser man or in less single-minded people, were insistent that he should enter Parliament, and placed time, money, health, and interest at his disposal.[1]

---

ment on every possible occasion for its encroachments on popular rights.

He took up the scandal of the Coldbath Fields Prison, and raised such a storm about their ears that the Prison Commissioners succeeded in getting him forbidden to visit any prison within the United Kingdom. In spite of this inhibition, however, his cause finally triumphed.

The most dramatic point in his career was his arrest on a question of breach of Parliamentary Privilege. After some days' hesitation, during which his house was garrisoned by Volunteers, with Francis Place at their head, a forcible entry was made, and Sir Francis was conveyed to the Tower.

His release, which took place after several months, was only prevented being made an occasion for a great popular demonstration by his slipping away unnoticed by water, to the great disgust of his partisans, especially Francis Place, who was so angry that he would not speak to him for years.

[1] I am indebted to Miss L. I. Guiney for the following note: *Notes and Queries*, 12 S. vol. iv., January, 1918, p. 4. (In a paper signed "M. Beza," on English Travellers among the Vlachs.)

"In 1838 appeared *The Spirit of The East*, by D. Urquhart. A special interest attaches to this, in his time, most influential political author. A Roumanian statesman and writer of note, I. Ghica, for many years representative at the Court of St. James, knew him well. In a letter he portrays him as 'a young man of short stature, delicate complexion, with pale face, long golden hair over his back, blue piercing eyes,'* and he further speaks of Urquhart's noble character, of his ardour in espousing the great causes for freedom. Indeed his *Spirit of the East* breathes in a large degree the tumultuous, fiery atmosphere of the Greek revolution. He deals in it with chiefs like Catchiandoni and Tchionga, both of the Vlach race; or, as Urquhart puts it, of 'these hardy mountaineers, nowhere fixed, but ever to be found where the wolves have dens and eagles nests' (Vol. I., 122)."

---

* Scrisori ale lui I. Ghica către V. Alexandri. Bucuresti, p. 144. No date given.

CHAPTER III

THE EAST AND MEDIÆVAL INSTITUTIONS

"We speak in unknown Tongues; the years
Interpret everything aright."
ALICE MEYNELL: *Builders of Ruins.*

THE chief of a Highland clan combines in himself the essential qualities of aristocracy and democracy. He is an aristocrat by position and a democrat by virtue of his blood-relationship with every member of his clan.

Though David Urquhart left the Highlands when he was eight years old and straightway, for the rest of his life, became a citizen of the world, he was always the chief of his clan and brother of all his clansmen. When he no longer possessed a rood of the lands of his forefathers there was nothing he loved better than to be called in Highland fashion by the name of the lands that had been theirs; and never did he lose the sense of kinship with the men of his clan. Pointing to the barefoot boy who drove the pigs, he would say with pride, "He is an Urquhart too."

Taken away as a child from amongst his own people, the feeling of human brotherhood, which would have spent itself on his clansmen, was widened to include not only his own countrymen, but all the human race: "Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto." All men were his brethren, bound to him by common ties and duties. They owed to him, and they had a right to expect from him, courtesy and justice. With his countrymen he had still stronger ties. It did not matter how lowly their condition, they were all, from the King to the humblest peasant, members of the State, and all alike were bound together by virtue of their duties to it, duties arising not from any accidental cause such as the franchise, or a position in the Legislature,

but just in the same way as the duties of individuals towards one another arose from their common partnership in the same society. For the ideal State has, like the family, been bound together by mutual courtesy and justice. Class distinctions were official; they were like rank in the army, to be respected and kept up, but they made no man another man's real superior or inferior.

It was not, however, till Urquhart went to the East that the strength of this aristo-democratic instinct of his revealed itelf to his consciousness. And, curiously enough, it was the East, the despotic East, as it seemed to most people, which awoke it.

He went to Turkey, as he tells us, full of prejudice, and what he saw there did not seem, at first sight, calculated to break down that prejudice. The heterogeneous Turkish Empire, composed of many nations, many religions, with its tyrannical jannisaries, its ruling and blood-sucking Pashas, each under the thumb of his attendant Armenian, its apparently complicated and yet loose financial system, which kept from seven to nine hundred clerks in continual occupation in the immense financial bureaux at Constantinople with so little apparent result, seemed at first sight an apotheosis of bad government.

It was some time before he found reason to modify his judgment.

"It was after three years of diligent statistical inquiries," he says in the Introduction to the *Spirit of the East*, "that I began to perceive that there were institutions connected with the East. From the moment that I did perceive the existence of peculiar, though distinct, principles, an intense interest was awakened in my mind, and I commenced a collection of financial details with a view to understanding the rules upon which they were based. Three more years were spent in this laborious uncertainty, and I collected and noted down the administration of two hundred and fifty towns and villages before I was struck with the common principles that guided their administration."[1]

During those three years was laid the foundation of all Urquhart's knowledge and love of the East. "They were,"

[1] *Spirit of the East;* Introductory chapter.

he says, "dumb years," because "when in the consideration of nations you come to ideas which cannot be accurately expressed by the symbols of your own language, you must revert to first principles, you must come back to the consideration of human nature."

This was exactly what the ordinary Eastern traveller could not do, or at any rate did not choose to do, and therefore he never learned the secret of Eastern administration.

"The ordinary Englishman," Urquhart says, "goes to the East convinced that he is a professor of political economy, who has possession of the science of government, and that in all respects he is a free man of an understanding mind. He discovers that the Turk considers a public debt a bad thing. 'The ignoramus!' he exclaims. That the Turk regards this debt as contrary to religion. 'Ah! the fanatic!' He discovers again that the Turk has a repugnance to the idea of an Assembly which makes laws. 'Ah! the slave!' That the Turk despises a representative chamber. 'Ah! the tool of despotism!' and so on to the end of the chapter. But if the Turk were to reveal to him his own ideas of the duties of a sovereign and the obligation of dethroning him when he does not fulfil them, or the necessity for every civil and military subordinate to be sure of the legality of an order before executing it, the European would lose himself in conjectures and astonishment, and would exclaim, 'These Turks are revolutionists and communists.' He would be a hundred leagues from perceiving that science and liberty, as he understands them, are only perversions arising from the impotence of past ages to resist the encroachments of authority, which has succeeded in subjugating the nations of Europe and putting them in handcuffs administrative, financial and intellectual."[1]

The first, and perhaps the most important, thing that Urquhart discovered was that Eastern nations did not consist of rulers and ruled: one part of the nation did not continually sit to legislate for the other part. The foundations of government and legislation rested on inviolate and inviolable custom, by which all were equally bound. The Sultan himself could not retain his throne did he attempt

[1] *Diplomatic Review*, vol. xxiv., p. 178: "Islam and the Constitutional System."

to override them. Moreover, the Government took no account of details. The people were not bound under penalties to obey rules and regulations quite independent of moral law.

The taxes were imposed, not on individuals, but on the municipia, for these were the units of the Eastern State. The municipalities were responsible for apportioning the taxes and for taxing themselves for their own necessary expenses. They maintained order within their own limits. They provided schools and schoolmasters. They organised their own trade, and thus industry and commerce were free. Indirect taxation was a thing unknown. In the East, said Urquhart, might still be seen feudalism in its earliest and uncorrupt stage. For in the East the military fief did not, as in Europe, involve possession of the soil, but only a right to one-tenth of its fruits, and that right carried with it the duty of protecting the cultivators, who had "an indefeasible right of property in the soil, as uncontrollably their own, as that of the blade of grass to the earth from which it springs." Such a right was of itself enough to raise the peasant proprietors of the East far above the unlanded and disinherited peasant of England, who had nothing he could call his own but his labour, and that he must sell, not at his own price, but at that of its purchaser.

Each municipality was a family, of which all the members were bound together by ties of mutual interdependence. If there was outside tyranny, as too often there was, under a corrupted[1] Mussulman Government, it was borne, and often resisted, by the whole community. Like the members of a Highland clan, the members of the municipality had each his own place and his own rank, and each his own human value equal to that of any Prince or Pasha. Therefore the active principles of Eastern municipal life were necessarily those vital principles of justice and courtesy which thus leavened the whole of Eastern society. All ranks, whether in the community or the family, associated

[1] Its corruption was largely due to Western interference with Eastern institutions.

without familiarity or condescension, but with mutual respect and courtesy, for human dignity was by no means affected by the accident of rank or position. Custom regulated manners as well as law, and by reason of custom all classes could associate with an ease and dignity which is almost unknown in Western life, except in the remoter parts of Ireland and Scotland. The master could use affectionate expressions towards his servant without evoking either presumption or suspicion, and servants, children and friends could, and did, perform the lowliest offices for their masters, parents or friends without any real or fancied loss of dignity. The class hatred which was springing up to devastate Europe was unknown in the East which Urquhart discovered in his early manhood.

It was an East of wide extent, for he was not content with knowing the Turkey of Constantinople, which his official duties necessitated his knowing; he had lived in the villages of Servia, he had travelled more than once through the Balkan Principalities and the parts of Greece still under the Turkish rule. He had lived as a Mussulman in the villages of Asiatic Turkey and in the tents of Arab sheikhs in the deserts. He visited Mount Lebanon, and first of any Englishman he penetrated into the mountain fastnesses of the Caucasus, where the Circassians were still fighting stubbornly to protect their country from the paw of the Russian bear. Everywhere he found the same characteristic features: freedom of trade, agriculture and craft going on side by side in the villages, strong independent municipalities which contained within themselves all the essentials of a republic, and, however great might be the poverty, no pauperism.

In 1838 Urquhart returned to England. It would not have been surprising had he forgotten all else in the consideration of his own private misfortunes. His diplomatic career had been unjustly and suddenly wrecked; he found himself involved in huge expenses for an undertaking for which he had had every reason[1] to believe the Government considered itself responsible, and he was struggling under

[1] The publication of the *Portfolio*.

one of those attacks of ill-health to which his sensitive temperament and abnormally active brain rendered him constantly liable.

But the ills of his country very soon absorbed him to the entire exclusion of his own. He had come back to a state of society the very antipodes of that which he had been studying for the past six years. He had come back from Eastern despotism to "a free and enlightened country," to find it, in his own words, "a nation of slaves." The overwhelming majority of the people had not as much as a foot of the ground of England they could call their own, even the right to feed cattle on the common lands they had lost.

They were entirely without a voice in the government of the country. The introduction of machinery had thrown thousands out of work, and had reduced the old handloom weavers of many once prosperous districts to absolute starvation. The old Poor Law, by giving relief in aid of wages, had enabled the farmer to pay to his labourers considerably less than a living wage, and the new Poor Law, by stopping this relief while trade was still disorganised and wages at starvation rate, had roused the people to a state of frenzy. The Reform Bill, from which the people had anticipated such great results, had, they declared, only made matters worse by putting the power into the hands of the Whigs, who proved themselves less sympathetic to working-class desires and aims than the Tories had been. The Whigs it was who brought in the hated Poor Law; who threw out the Factory Bill, which was intended greatly to diminish, if not abolish, child-labour; who steadily refused any further extension of the franchise. Poverty and distress were everywhere rife; with a population of seventeen millions, eight million pounds were spent yearly in poor relief. The people were in a state of smouldering discontent and class-hatred, which might break out at any time into open flame. The moment that the prohibition to combine was removed from the working men, and even before that, large organisations were founded all over the country. The Political Unions, the Trade Unions, and the "Asso-

ciations of the Useful Classes," were all animated by hatred more or less intense of the classes above them, and all determined, some by moral force, some by violence, to make their voices heard in the government of the country.

Urquhart had not at first any intention of interfering in the Labour troubles of his time. He had come home to settle scores with Palmerston over the Turkish Commercial Treaty, and his own recall from the Turkish Embassy, and to try to bring before the country generally the importance of right and just relations with other countries. Probably the deplorable condition, both moral and physical, of the working classes had not especially struck him, but in his journeys from one large commercial centre to another, where he spoke to large meetings at the invitation of merchants and manufacturers, he could not fail to be impressed by the contrast between the general prosperity of the country and the poverty of the poor. It was not, however, till he had been invited to stand in the Tory interest for St. Marylebone, that Urquhart came in contact with the movement which is now known as Chartism.

He never was a Tory; in fact, he never belonged to any party except that of his country. But as Disraeli indicated in his speech against Attwood's Petition in July, 1839, the Tory party had shown more practical sympathy than the Whigs for the working classes. It was but natural. The old landed proprietors belonged to the soil; so did the peasant, though his right in it had been lost. There was still a bond which connected together the landed proprietor and the peasant, a remnant of the feudal relations of protector and protected. But in the middle-class parvenus, who had come to power with the Reform Bill of 1832, this bond was absent, and the working class bitterly realised that their "shopocrat" masters, as they contemptuously called them, were worse tyrants than the aristocrats had been. Therefore, if Urquhart could be said to have had anything in common with any party it was with the Tories. He probably recognised this when he consented to stand for Marylebone. But the candidature did not go farther than a public meeting. He was very soon engrossed in other work.

At that meeting three leading Chartists were present. They had been attracted by the soundness and originality of his views upon commerce, and had come to this meeting partly to hear what he had to say and partly to heckle. But when it was over they begged him to attend a private meeting of their own. He went; he met them and their friends, not once but many times, and his lifelong and affectionate connection with the working classes began.

It must not be forgotten that the Chartists were by no means a united body with unanimous aims. As a matter of fact they had sprung from at least three distinct sources: the National Political Union, which had agitated for the Reform Bill and had practically died down after it was passed; the Trades Unions, closely connected with the European Societies of Trades Unions, which organised the riots of 1834; and the "Association for the Moral, Social, and Political Improvement of the Industrious Classes." This last was the most important of all as regards real working-class advance, for it was an attempt on the part of the operatives to be their own organisers and leaders. The political unions had been very largely supported and led by merchants, manufacturers, and shopkeepers. The working men's association, organised at the beginning by an American, Doctor Black, and his friend Detroisier, who took in hand and attempted to carry through the repeal of the stamp duty on newspapers, began in a back room at Francis Place's shop in Charing Cross Road.

It took Dr. Black some time to overcome the suspicions of the working men, who, since the collapse of the Political Unions, were thoroughly mistrustful of the middle classes, but he overcame this mistrust by devoting evening after evening to their instruction in "common school subjects." Detroisier and Henry Hetherington,[1] with some of Black's evening-class pupils, founded the first Working Men's Association. The Associations spread with very great rapidity, and their rules forbade any but working men to be in any official position in them. They had, however,

[1] The champion of the unstamped Press, and editor of *The Poor Man's Guardian*.

many sympathisers among the middle classes, and the London meetings were attended by Members of Parliament, such as Sir William Molesworth, Fielden and Roebuck. Their aims were perhaps at first more educational than political. They established libraries, opened reading-rooms, and brought out elaborate plans for national education, which was not to be in the hands of the Government, but of local authorities.

But they soon became aware that to carry out any successful schemes they must have more political power. Lord John Russell's speech in 1837, in which he expressed himself against all that the working classes had been working for since the passing of the Reform Bill—Triennial Parliaments, the Extension of the Franchise and Voting by Ballot—finally roused them to action. The London Association appointed six members of its committee in conjunction with six sympathetic Members of Parliament to draw up a Bill embodying the rights which the people demanded, the People's Charter which it now was for the first time called. To further their aims the Associations combined with the Birmingham Political Union, which had revived under the leadership of Mr. Thomas Attwood, and the Trades Unions to call a monster Convention in London, to which delegates were to be sent from all towns and villages in the United Kingdom. Addresses were sent to all the Radical Associations, missionaries were sent out, subscriptions or "rents" were collected, monster meetings were held. In some places more than thirty thousand people assembled, and in spite of the growing fear of the Government, and the vexatious, and in many cases unjust, methods adopted to repress it, the movement steadily grew in numbers and determination. So powerful did it become that the Chartists might have carried all before them had it not been that their house was divided against itself. One party, the moral force party, desired to use only constitutional means to gain their ends; Law, Peace and Order was their motto. The other, the physical force party, declared that nothing could be done with peaceful methods unless behind them they had the means and the will to adopt force.

Such was the position of the Chartists when Mr. Urquhart first came in contact with them and gained the friendship of many of their prominent men, at the same time that he showed himself to be an enemy of the movement.

Urquhart's attitude towards the working man was entirely unique. There was in it not a touch of familiarity or of condescension; he met them on the terms of the most complete equality, while at the same time he maintained his own position and expected them to maintain theirs. He had no sympathy with the philanthropist or the economist, both of whom apparently believed that between the classes favoured by God with all that made life desirable and those deprived of them, obviously by the same Agency, there was a great gulf fixed.

The philanthropist tried to mend their condition by some slight efforts to supply here and there the most obvious and crying needs of the poor, but more especially by preaching contentment with their lot and submission to their betters.

The economist regarded the state of things as an inevitable result of fixed laws. The poverty of the poor, said he, is the result of the laws of demand and supply; we are over-peopled, let us limit our population. The dislocation of trade arises from the want of division of labour. Economic laws cannot be altered; they must be studied and we must live according to them.

But David Urquhart could not deal with the problem either as a philanthropist or as an economist. He must deal with it as a man, or not at all. And it seemed to him that in the East he had learnt the secret of so doing.

But was it possible that Eastern methods could be applied to Western peoples? The ordinary observer would have said "No"; Urquhart said "Yes"; for he maintained that the methods of government which the East had retained were, broadly speaking, the methods of the whole of Europe in the Middle Ages.[1] In mediæval

[1] The Guild Socialists are Urquhart's direct descendants in pleading for a return to Mediævalism. See H. J. Penty, *Guilds and the Social Crisis.*

Europe moral law was the recognised basis of government, as it was still in the East. The effect of that recognition was justice in public relations and courtesy in private life; for justice and courtesy are but different aspects of the recognition of law. A man who gives, in his private relations, to children and servants, to inferiors and superiors, that courtesy which is their due, will not withhold, in his public dealings, the justice which is the foundation of public life. And a nation whose social life is built on courtesy will not fail in its public relations with other nations. That virtue in the Turk which prevents his drawing his sword against an enemy until he is convinced that the cause is just is the same virtue which makes him courteous in all his relationships. So in the Middle Ages all relationships, from the relation of nation to nation to the relation of a servant to his master, rested on the same broad principles of moral law and unwritten custom. All men knew that law; it did not follow that they obeyed it, but no one questioned it. And over all there was an authority capable of visiting its infringement with penalties. Within the wide bounds of that law individuals were free; they were not subject, as under modern government, to rules and restrictions having no moral force but the will of the ruling majorities.

Taxation moreover was open and direct. The Public Revenue was not drawn from taxes on the necessaries of life. Communities not only apportioned but assessed their own taxes; and they were only asked to pay extraordinary taxes. Ordinary taxes were paid out of Crown lands and by the Feudal Lord. It was his demesne, not the poor man's few acres, which paid the expenses of government.

As in the East, moreover, so in the Middle Ages pauperism was a thing unknown, for hospitality was a religious duty. No man might be without food and lodging within the bounds of a Christian parish. Of all the Church property in England one-third was devoted to the care of the accidental poor in the different parishes.[1]

But the most important point, and the one in which

[1] For Feudalism and Pauperism see Urquhart's pamphlet, *Wealth and Want.*

modern England diverged most widely, not only from the England of the Middle Ages, but from the whole ancient world, was the practice of domestic industry. Before the days of Morris and Ruskin, when the whole of England was rejoicing in the wonderful invention of power-looms, and only the working men talked of the factory system as "damnable," Urquhart declared that the new industrial system was but the beginning of the end of the greatness of the nation.

"The loss of the spinning-wheel was like the loss of the shoe, after that the horse went, and after that—there was no longer a State but only a jumble. . . .

"Before the subdivision of labour was known as a process of science, the people of England, then called 'merry,' manufactured at home, in the intervals of field labour, the clothing requisite for their families out of the produce of their land and their flocks. England was consequently a self-subsisting country, and neither depended herself for existence on the accidents of war, and a bolstered-up credit at home, nor infected remote regions with her flimsy stuff and vulgar patterns. The millions did not live in trembling dependence from hand to mouth, nor were there cotton lords to revel in coarse and ungainly luxury. This change was brought by science; men could produce more when their industry was confined to a pin's point, and the great idol, Cheapness, was set up; distant lands adored, but the people at home were crushed.

"Civilisation draws everything to the towns and makes each family dependent on the factory; to that den is not transferred the sanctification of the household by its easy tasks and varied occupations, which has now departed. In addition to the rest you divide the people into two hostile camps of clownish boors and emasculated dwarfs. Good heavens! a nation divided into agricultural and commercial interests calling herself sane! nay, styling herself enlightened and civilised, not only in spite of but in consequence of this monstrous and unnatural division.

"A family engaged in field work will have sufficient idle time upon its hands to spin, weave, make up the stuffs wherever the practice of those civilising arts is pursued, at no cost at all.[1]

[1] "Twenty pounds of wool, converted unobtrusively into the yearly clothing of a labouring family, makes no show, but bring it to market, send it to the factory, bring it thence to the broker, send it

"The cost, or gain, is healthful industry. It is a matter of habit, not of reasoning; where the habit of preparing these articles exists there is no reasoning about it—neither is there where it is the custom to go to the slop shop.

"A people in the first condition would be horrified at the idea of expending money for what they could do themselves. A people in the second would be confounded at the proposal to spin their own yarn and knit their stockings, and conceive it to be a furious encroachment on the gin shop for the man and the slop shop for the woman.

". . . England, the wealthiest of lands and the first in the scale of industry, is the country in which, above all others, domestic industry has disappeared. It is also the home of pauperism and panics. Other countries in various degrees approach to her in the subdivision of labour and in an equal degree in the extinction of domestic industry. In like proportion are they afflicted with pauperism and panic.

"Pauperism and panic are unknown to-day in the East. They were unknown throughout the whole of the ancient world.

"Domestic industry is practised in the East. It was practised in ancient times in every portion of the globe. The opposite plan was the discovery of England; it has been, in her own estimation, her greatness. It has given to her colossal riches as the gain of a few, and unparalleled misery as the gain of the rest.

"Could the hard breathings and choking thoughts of a second of time in these realms be condensed into one utterance, it would overcome the concentrated groan of the misery endured throughout the remaining eight hundred millions of the human race throughout the course of the present and many preceding generations."[1]

In all these ways, Urquhart maintained, in respect for the moral law, self-government, freedom of trade and the

---

to the dealer, and it will represent commercial operations and apparent capital to the amount of twenty times its value, and costs to the labourer when returned to him twice as much as it would cost him in dyeing, spinning, and weaving. The working class is thus amerced to support a wretched factory population, a parasitical shop-keeping class and a fictitious monetary and financial system. The landlord, for his share, pays five shillings per acre Poor Rates. All this is the result not of cheapness but of delusion.

"The people of England were better clothed and fed when there was no commerce and when there were no factories."

[1] *Free Press*, December 1, 1855: "Domestic Manufactures."

love for and skill in craft, did the East show what the Middle Ages had been and what Modern Europe had lost. And with this loss, nay, because of this loss, she had suffered a far greater loss, the loss of idealism and the loss of individual character. Underneath the life of the Middle Ages lay the basic principle of a strong religious faith. Above all earthly rule there stood, its model and its monitor, the spiritual rule of the Papacy, the Grand Justiciary of Europe. Individual popes might be ambitious, criminal and self-seeking. The ideal of the spiritual State to which all temporal sovereignty must bow was never attained, but who that looks on the world now must not see that the world was the better for such an ideal ? It affected not only the policy of statesmen, but the lives of individuals. Private character was stronger, more self-reliant, better developed. Men did not prostitute their judgment to public opinion, or get any idea they might possess from a newspaper article. Idealism, obedience, respect for authority, all the things that a vain and shallow pretence at independence professes to scorn, developed, instead of stultifying, character, stimulated thought, and safeguarded freedom. In the Middle Ages men were really free.

" Liberty is ancient; it is despotism that is modern."

It was, said Urquhart, this idealism, this strength of character, this power of being right, that the working men must strive to gain. Nothing else that they had lost could they regain, no advance could the nation make till they had this. They must divest themselves of the spirit of the age with all its corruption, injustice and want of thought, they must divest themselves of themselves, for they partook of the spirit of the age. Each man must go back to the simple self, to the man that lay beneath all the corruption which his age had fastened on him, to the elemental virtue and simplicity which makes the true man. Then, and then only, might they hope for a real change in the life and social condition of the Nations.

Of course the ideal was, like all great ideals, impossible of attainment. The attempt failed, but it was a failure greater than many a success.

PART II

HOW HE FOUGHT FOR JUSTICE IN ENGLAND

"And the Mills of Satan were separated into a moony Space
Among the rocks of Albion's Temples, and Satan's Druid Sons
Offer the human Victims throughout all the Earth."

BLAKE: *Milton*, folio 9, lines 6–8.

"And did those feet in ancient time
Walk upon England's mountains green ?
And was the holy Lamb of God
On England's pleasant pastures seen ?

"And did the Countenance Divine
Shine forth upon our clouded hills ?
And was Jerusalem builded here
Among these dark Satanic Mills ?

"Bring me my bow of burning gold !
Bring me my arrows of desire !
Bring me my spear ! O clouds, unfold !
Bring me my chariot of fire !

"I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land."

BLAKE: *Milton*, folio 2.

CHAPTER IV

CHARTISM

"Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong."—JEREMIAH xxii. 13.

URQUHART came to the working men of England in 1839 with what seemed to them a new Social Gospel.

It was indeed that by which their forefathers had shaped their lives in the Middle Ages; but it was the East which had revealed it to him.

It was the East, moreover, which had taught him the rottenness of a civilisation based on injustice and a so-called economic system.

During his journeys from town to town in his connection with the mercantile class, the wrongs of the English operative classes were opened to his keen sight. It was apparently in 1838, during a visit to Glasgow, that he first came into personal contact with them, when he and his fellow-workers succeeded in getting together small bodies of operatives as well as merchants to discuss the commercial relations of England to other countries.

In some places operatives and merchants sat at the same table and discussed the same subjects. At Newcastle his friend William Cargill, a member of one of the prominent merchant families of the town, carrying on an important trade with the East, greatly aided him, and succeeded in gaining the confidence of many working men. George Fyler, a young barrister with commercial connections, seconded his efforts in London, while Robert Monteith, David Ross of Bladensburg, and Charles Attwood, did the same thing in Glasgow, Birmingham, and Lancashire. Urquhart himself, as time went on, became gradually more

and more convinced that any hope for the future of England lay with the working man, oppressed, poverty-stricken, disenfranchised as he was.

"I speak to the operatives because my interest is in working men," he said in a speech at Stafford. "I care not for the gentlemen: they have means, power, possessions, wealth, and all those things which would secure existence, if not honour, in any country, if not in this; but in addressing the operatives I speak to those whom fate has fixed on the soil upon which we live, who can have no interest except in its prosperity. The higher orders may be corrupt and the nation sound. But in addressing the operatives I speak to those who, if their heart is cold to their country and their ears closed to reason, leave to their State no hope whatever of regeneration or restoration."

We who live in a time when the working man is coming, if he has not already come, to his own, can scarcely realise the political insight and the grasp of future possibilities which such a point of view indicated in a man, young, without prestige or influence, who could stand up and speak so to a society which regarded the working man, struggling for justice, as some sort of wild beast; at a time when a judge on the bench could, without condemnation, stigmatise the "lower orders" as "wholly vicious"; at a time when the police harried them with spies and informers, and the Government, whether Whig or Tory, treated their most legitimate criticisms on its methods of procedure as sedition and conspiracy.

Urquhart's relation to the working classes was intensely human; it was entirely unpolitical, and it culminated during the Chartist rising in a situation of extreme interest.

It was in 1839 that he first came into contact with the Chartist leaders; that this man on fire with the love of justice and hatred of oppression, the stern upholder of moral law as the highest thing he knew, came into contact with men in whose souls the iron of injustice was rankling, many of whom were smarting under recent and unjust punishment, and were ready to cast aside all law, moral and civil, in order to attain to the liberty they felt

was their due. An electric spark was lit, apparently opposite elements became united, and David Urquhart was joined to the operatives by a bond that was to last to the end of a long life.

The Scottish aristocrat, the polished cosmopolitan, drew to his side and linked his career finally and entirely, not with the respectable mechanics and artisans of the twentieth century, but with the starved, despised, and, as his *soi-disant* betters called him, the "degraded" factory hand, with the potters, the weavers, and the labourers of early Victorian days. Not as a superior did he join forces with them, but as an equal, a fellow-citizen, a fellow-Englishman, a man with common duties and common rights. He had his position in society, they had theirs. He had something to teach them, but when they had learnt it, their duty, no less than his, was to go and put the lessons into practice, to serve their country and to teach others what they had learnt. The relationship between Urquhart and the operatives never degenerated into familiarity on their side or to patronage and philanthropy on his. On both sides it was always respectful, simple, and sincere. To his working-men friends he meted out the same treatment as he did to his social equals. Neither escaped the fiery furnace of indignation and scorn which followed any display of insincerity or stupidity. But if there was any distinction it was in favour of the working man. It was against smug, wealthy, middle-class self-satisfaction, or political self-seeking, that his most fiery darts were hurled. His devoted adherents were often reduced to despair, because he alienated by fierce denunciations wealthy and influential people, whom it seemed to them all-important to gain, while he would spend patient hours trying to convince one or two working men or instructing a young girl. "My best converts, apart from working men," he was wont to say, "are men of genius and young girls."

In 1839, when Urquhart first came into contact with the Chartists as Chartists, they were in a very dangerous mood. The monster Petition with 2,000,000 signatures, their last hope of obtaining their demands by peaceful means, had

been contemptuously set aside by the Government. Those of them who had always maintained that in the end they must resort to physical force to obtain their ends were in the ascendancy, and there is no doubt that the preparations for a universal armed rising were wide and well-organised. Mr. Urquhart's conviction that foreign agents had a large share in these preparations is not unsupported by independent evidence.

The English Trades Unions had always been in very close connection with the foreign Unions.[1] There was a Central Democratic Association composed of Poles, Italians, Germans, and French, which was strong enough to provide that Haynau, the notoriously cruel Austrian General, when he paid a visit to Barclay and Perkins's Brewery should be set upon, pursued and so frightened, that he was forced to take refuge in a dust-bin.

Information of great and extensive revolutionary preparations reached the Government by side winds. The police heard from their spies and informers of orders for as many as 10,000 powder cans being given to jobbing tin-workers in Bethnal Green,[2] and an informer writes that it has come to his knowledge that many thousand pikes and weapons are being made, also triangular forked instruments, for placing across the streets to injure the feet of cavalry horses.

In 1839 an informer in a secret report[3] writes from Manchester:

"My Lord, the Radicals in Manchester muster thirty-six divisions of one hundred men each, subdivided into sections of twenty each under staunch leaders, who bind themselves by certain rules and regulations to stand by one another even unto death. They are ruled by a Council of Twelve in each district. Ashton-under-Lyne, including Dunkerfield, has fifty-two divisions, Stalybridge seventeen divisions,

[1] When the type-founders employed by Messrs. Caster in Chiswell Street, E.C., struck work on account of a reduction of 20 per cent. in their wages, word was immediately sent round to the Trades Unions of France and Belgium, with the result that Messrs. Caster, who sent for men to both these countries, could only get nine French workmen, and that at 30s. a week higher wages than they had been paying.

[2] Home Office Papers, 64, 15, 1834. [3] *Ibid.*, 64, 15.

all sub-divided as above. The whole of these men have arms of some sort. My Lord, I must say that I find the working classes almost to a man determined Republicans and extremely discontented. . . . Thousands of them will join the Union men when a break-out takes place. There have been plans prepared to make the Government yield. The one was for all the Unions and others that would join them to march up to London and by force of numbers to compel the Government to grant the Charter. In the Union last night[1] I asked how we could subsist on the journey; their answer was, 'There is plenty of money in the banks of which we can take possession.' This morning a letter was read from Richardson, one of the Manchester deputies, now in London, advising all the Unions to hold themselves in readiness for simultaneous meetings all over the country on the same day, and ordering the Manchester flag that bears the inscription 'Annual Parliaments' to be altered to 'The People's Parliament.' He seems to have no hopes of the present Government granting their requests."

It was Urquhart's idea that underneath the ordinary Chartist body there was a secret organisation governed by foreign agents. None of the rank and file of the Chartists knew of the whole conspiracy, which was so thorough and well-laid as to be a great menace to the Government. Of this he became convinced at his first meeting with the Chartist leaders at Marylebone in 1839, and in his own account of the event written thirty-three years afterwards he maintained it with absolute certainty.

Urquhart's connection with the Chartist movement dates from his nomination as Tory candidate for the Borough of Marylebone in September, 1839, to which, at the urgent entreaty of his friends, he had consented. In order to prepare the way a meeting was called by his friends in the Mechanics' Institute, New Road, "to take into consideration the Commercial, Domestic, and Foreign Affairs of the Nation." It was attended by a large body of Chartists, headed by William Cardo, the delegate for Marylebone at the Convention, who acted as spokesman.

[1] It was a usual plan for spies to join the Trades Unions. Sometimes they rose to eminent positions, where they were extremely useful to the Government.

George Fyler, a London barrister and disciple of Urquhart's, who was present at the meeting, was already acquainted with the Chartist Westrup,[1] who had approached him on the subject of the formation of a London Chamber of Commerce. Having got into conversation with Cardo through Westrup at the meeting, Fyler determined to pursue his acquaintance.

The Chartists on their side had been struck by the views of Mr. Urquhart and his friends which they had heard, for the first time, fairly stated.

"It appears," writes Fyler, "that my speech created a sensation among the Chartists, that you and your views have been the subject of discussion with the Convention at Marylebone. The result of this was my sending Westrup, who has become most valuable, back to Cardo, ready primed. He saw him and had a conversational discussion with the Convention about you, which has terminated satisfactorily, and Cardo is to be with me to-morrow night. I had Westrup to breakfast with me this morning, and he was to have brought a Mr. O'Brien, an Irish barrister of good family, a Chartist of great influence, and a man, Westrup says, of great talent. O'Brien, however, could not come: I expect him to-night, about ten."

Fyler met Bronterre O'Brien, that fiery advocate of physical force, as well as Cardo. But he did not succeed in converting them.

"Mr. Cardo still did not see in what I said the means of solving these internal difficulties which he felt, or of raising the poor and industrious man from the miserable state of dependence and oppression in which he stood. Mr. O'Brien had not quite made up his mind that we should not be all the better without foreign trade. . . . I left him with no other impression than appears in the willing expression that he should be very happy to co-operate or give effect to the labours of such gentlemen as Mr. Urquhart. . . . But Mr. Urquhart, at my request, came up to London, and the scene was changed. Mr. Westrup and Mr. Cardo called on me; I took them to Colonel Pringle Taylor's, where Mr. Urquhart was, and, to use Mr. Cardo's expressive

[1] Hovell, in *The Chartist Movement*, calls him Westrapp, but he signs himself in his letters Westrop or Westrup indiscriminately.

words the next day, ' in less than five minutes Mr. Urquhart had solved all these difficulties without my having felt it necessary to state them.' . . . In the evening O'Brien came to the Colonial Society with Messrs. Cardo and Westrup. It was not in language to convey what passed on that occasion, the extensive range of subjects which, in the two hours it lasted, Mr. Urquhart grasped, laying bare the character, the injurious and deleterious effects of our boasted institutions, and, in a few simple words, not alone leading the hearer to understand the bearings of the subject but to the reception of similar convictions to his own. He pointed out the source of the evils under which the nations groaned, and that the only remedy is in returning to the simple institutions of our forefathers, and he showed the effect of indirect taxation on the character of the people, the influence of local government in the development of powers of the human mind, its effect on the internal state of the country, rendering a police, poor laws, custom-houses, and all those other adjuncts of what is called a civilised people unnecessary. . . . On Thursday morning they came again. Lord Dudley Stuart and Mr. Carey were likewise present. It is impossible to go through these extraordinary conversations, or, rather, addresses. I can only convey their effect to the mind of another, by stating the deep silence and continued attention and interest with which Mr. Urquhart was listened to, an occasional remark made being rather to elucidate a further explanation than the statement of any objection."

At the public meeting held soon after, Mr. Cardo " with great simplicity, intelligence, and power " communicated to his audience that he had at length found a means of arriving at truth, that he perceived a certainty of accomplishing the great object for which they had been struggling, not by the triumph of one party, but by the sinking of all those dissensions and party differences that existed among them.

Cardo and Westrup were won, and with them the delegate from Bolton, Warden, a man unlike Cardo, opposed to physical force for gaining the ends of labour, intelligent, gentle, and conscientious. These and other of their friends at last felt impelled to lay before Urquhart, this new friend who had inspired them with such confidence, the danger to the country which was involved in the Chartist plot.

"The Chartists," they said, "disappointed in the hopes they had entertained of realising their projects peaceably, were now, to the amount of nearly two millions throughout the land, aroused and ready to accomplish their objects by national convulsion; all their numerous armies in the North, in the West, as well as in the South, had intended some early day before the first of January to put themselves in motion. They had already shells and rockets which were explosive, spikes for the feet of cavalry horses, and other ammunitions of war prepared in secret in Birmingham."

Urquhart and his friends took action on this information; they not only laid the whole before Lord Normanby, but without trusting to anything the Government (which was, or affected to be, sceptical of the extent of the Chartist conspiracy) might or might not do, they went themselves from town to town, seeing the leaders, and if they did not win them over to their side, at least making them afraid to act, from the knowledge that their plans were known.

Mr. Urquhart, writing in 1854 to a working men's association in Manchester, gives his own account of these strange happenings.

"Having accepted the proposal to stand for Marylebone, and several meetings having been held, the Chartists came in a body to interrupt them, having somehow been informed that I was a dangerous person, as representing trade, diplomacy and Toryism. I was not present at the meeting, but after it one of them, a friend of mine, said to the leader of the Chartists: 'I see you are an able man. Would it not suit those qualities better to try and understand Mr. Urquhart first and reserve your denunciations for afterwards?'

"Accordingly he (the Chartist) came to me and asked what I considered were the evils of England and what I proposed as a remedy.

"But when I had begun to tell him he rose and said: 'I cannot listen to this alone. Will you allow me to bring some of my friends to-morrow night?'

"They came, and returned again and again.

"The Charter was never mentioned, nor the suffrage, nor any meanness of that kind.

"I think it was the third time, at between two and three in the morning, they said they could not lay their heads

on their pillows till they had revealed to me the fate prepared for the doomed city sunk in slumber. They had not gone far in their narrative before we came upon a Russian[1] agent as mover and director of the whole plan. Not an instant was lost. With the aid of these men and others which they brought, and collecting all my available friends, amounting to about twenty or thirty individuals in all, we proceeded to deal with the confederacy, now broken in London, throughout the provinces.

"I visited every district, saw every leader.

"There was no change in my language because of what I had learnt. The Charter was never mentioned from beginning to end.

"It was by showing another and a better way that doubts came over them as to the judiciousness of continuing in that in which they were engaged, and men in doubt do not risk property, liberty and life.

"Frost was missed by half an hour; otherwise this danger would have been averted without leaving a trace behind of its existence."

The campaign against Chartism started with great hopes. The working men would be won, and with them the country.

Urquhart was deeply impressed with the intelligence and the sincerity of the operatives.

"There are in this body," he said, "immense resources; they are individually more simple, more honest, and more thoughtful than the upper orders; there is a consciousness among them of community of interests, and there is sympathy for each other; they consider themselves as a class and not as a party; their minds are set to work to inquire and to investigate; and therefore it is that my hopes for the salvation of their country are centred on them."

The line he took in his first dealings with the Chartists was

[1] Benyouski. (See *Northern Liberator*, November and December, 1840.) He had been an officer in the Polish Lancers. He was a Russian Pole whom Urquhart believed to have been in the employ of the Russian Secret Service.

There is little doubt but that he was one of the principal leaders of the Chartist Movement and his presence was always followed by revolution. Urquhart's life was twice attempted during his crusade against Chartism; once he had to escape from a house over the roofs of the neighbouring houses.

that to gain the six points of the Charter would do them no good so long as the whole nation persisted in its downward course.

Class injustice and class distress were but symptoms.

The real disease lay deeper. It was to the unjust and foolish Foreign Policy of England and the disloyalty of her Governments to her ancient Constitution and to the principles of justice, both in international and national affairs, that the present distress of the operatives was due.

The nation had gone astray. It was declining more and more from the old paths of justice and honour. This was the fault of the whole people, not of a few; it was the fault of each individual. It had come about gradually, and its primary cause was the loss of municipal government, which had produced loss of the sense of responsibility. Men had come to think that affairs of state were no concern of theirs. They had committed the Government to representatives, to whom they had also committed their thinking. Instead of thought-out opinions they had adopted party catchwords, and so had got into a vicious circle, wherein loose thought had debased speech, and this in turn had corrupted thought, until men neither knew what they thought nor how they ought to act. They had lost the faculty of judgment.

"If you, the nation, judge soundly," he said to a little body of Chartists who came to ask his counsel, "it would not matter what the form of government might be. . . . It is the knowledge and simplicity of the men which constitute the value of the accidental institutions under which they live. Monarchy, Despotism, Democracy and Oligarchy have all been base and baneful as they have all been great and beneficial. The form of government has no more to do with your conclusions than the fashion of your clothes. The fashion of your clothes, as the form of your government, may react upon you, but again it is but the reaction of your own thoughts upon yourselves. . . . Government can do no people any good. Government is always a load to bear, but it is necessary as a curb to place upon the evil passions of men, whether those passions are exhibited in individual acts of injustice, or in international assaults, which have to be resisted abroad. These are the legitimate objects of government, and all else is bad. . . ."

Such was the foundation of Urquhart's teaching, and so he drew the nobler spirits among the Chartists to himself. Those who were frankly revolutionary, or wished to be the leaders of a great party, like O'Brien[1] and Feargus O'Connor, and those to whom the Charter was an end in itself, beyond which they could not see, held aloof or were openly hostile. Many of them seriously thought that David Urquhart was a Tory, that the whole movement had been "hatched in the Carlton Club," and that the "Foreign Policy cry was a red herring drawn across the trail to draw off the attention of the operatives from the Charter." The Government took another view. Lord Normanby considered Mr. Urqu-

[1] Bronterre O'Brien, however, in after years found that he had many points of agreement with Urquhart.

On February 12, 1856, in a speech which he delivered on the Crimean War at the John Street Institute, Fitzroy Square, he said:

"Let it not be pretended, then, that Turkey needed our assistance, or that of France. If left to her own resources the whole Turkish population would have risen *en masse*, and no power that Russia could have brought into the field could have availed against such a force on Turkish soil.

"Mr. Urquhart was quite right when he said, it was not. Turkey's weakness but Turkey's strength that the Allies really feared; and that, instead of going to save her, they sent their fleets and armies to prevent her from saving herself.

"Every incident of the War, every measure and fact of our policy towards Turkey, goes to prove the truth of Mr. Urquhart's asseverations.

"France and England have done more to destroy the independence of Turkey in one year, by their pretended alliance, than Russia could have done by fifty years of war.

"We have, by our Machiavellian policy, destroyed her three principal armies; we have caused one part of her fleet to be destroyed at Synope, and the rest to be either used as transports or left to rot in their harbours. We have caused 3,000 of her seamen to perish for lack of pay and necessaries. We left the brave garrison of Kars to capitulate for want of bread and powder, after all their heroic sacrifices, not sending them a single regiment, when the Allies could have spared at least twenty from the Crimea (where they had nothing to do), not sending them a single ration of bread, or a parah, when we had immense stores accumulated within a few days' sail of them, and while it was known to us that nearly three years' arrears of pay were due to that brave garrison.

"To talk of helping Turkey under such circumstances was only a cruel mockery.

"We have only taken the place of Russia, in order to do to Turkey what we charged Nicholas with having designed to do.

"We have left her literally without a fleet, also without an army, except the miserable remnant of some 30,000. . . . This is what is called helping Turkey!"

hart "nothing but a Chartist with the Foreign Policy added."

But the anger of the Chartists was strongly directed towards their old leaders who had joined the "Foreign Policy men," when some of them, like Cardo, Lowery, Warden, Westrup, Thomason, and Richards, went about the various towns and districts where Chartists had lost hold, trying, not to destroy Chartism, but to show the Chartists a more excellent way. Many of them were quite ready for such showing; for the better sort were full of fear as to the way in which things were going. The members of the Convention seem to have felt that plans were being laid and plots hatched by small coteries of desperate men who had no patience to wait for the slow workings of petitions which were disregarded and appeals which were ignored.

None of the converted Chartists showed more enthusiasm, ability, and power of absorbing and reproducing the new ideas than William Cardo. Two months after his first meeting with David Urquhart we find him conducting a public meeting at Birmingham, of which this is his account:

"In my first address to the people of Birmingham after showing them the injury done to the labour and capital of this country by the expansion of the Russian Empire and the almost universal exercise of Russian influence, all directed to the destruction of British commerce, likewise the blockades carried out by France, through which one Button Manufacturer told me he had lost a market that he used to supply annually with hundreds of thousands gross of buttons, the men that made them he was compelled to discharge, and they were reduced to all the sufferings and privations consequent on want of employment. They have since been compelled to find employment in other trades that were already overstocked with workmen. Also the large import duties allowed to be put on British goods, having the effect of entirely destroying the Trade, or otherwise compelling the manufacturer to reduce considerably the wages of his workmen to enable the merchants to pay them. I have given you this outline to show how I connect the interests of industry with the Foreign Policy of the Country."[1]

[1] The letters and speeches of the working men have been given without alteration of any kind, either of diction, grammar, or spelling.

At a Chartist meeting which took place when he was in Birmingham, Cardo opposed to the suggestion of an anti-Corn Law agitation the Russo-Turkish policy of the Government, pointing out how it increased the price of corn, and took the opportunity to speak of Eastern municipal institutions. He seems to have made some impression, for he was invited to attend a Committee and argue out the matter with the supporters of the anti-Corn Law agitators.

"I have determined," he said, "that no individual with whom I am in contact, whether in public or in private, shall remain ignorant of the designs of Russia and the treason of Lord Palmerston, not forgetting those institutions that Mr. Urquhart has made known to the world, and the existence of which I trust I shall live to see in this country, for it is then I look forward to the emancipation of that class to which I belong and the general happiness and prosperity of society."

In April, 1840, Cardo was the principal speaker at a public meeting at Newcastle, the immediate and very important result of which was the re-embodiment of the Northern Political Union,[1] a distinctly Chartist body with a policy of Universal Suffrage.

It was reorganised with an addition of seventy new members "for the express purpose of inquiring into matters of which they had previously no knowledge."

"The facts stated at the meeting," says Cargill in a letter to Monteith, "came upon them like a clap of thunder; and as the Northern Political Union is a leading one, the subject taken up energetically by them will not fail also to be considered with attention by the rest of the working classes."

A day or two before this meeting Cardo, Taylor and Julius Harney had spoken together at a meeting at Carlisle,[2]

[1] See *Northern Liberator*, April, 1840.

[2] The meeting was a highly respectable one for the "Promotion of Sabbath Observance"; but Cardo and his followers took possession of it by force and used it for a very different purpose. They had been refused the use of the Town Hall by the Mayor. The full account of it is given in the *Northern Liberator*, which strongly sympathised with the Urquhart movement. The *Northern Star* was, on the other hand, fierce in its abuse of the "Foreign Policy Men."

denouncing the treasonable Foreign Policy of the Government which had brought the country into its condition of distress. Cardo was already becoming known as belonging to the "Foreign Policy" party. He was a shoemaker by trade, and evidently a man of quick intelligence and much personal attraction, with the powers and temperament of an orator. Robert Monteith says, in describing the effect he produced at a public meeting: "He was firm, earnest and sonorous to a degree I had no notion of, a Danton without his ferocity." In the Convention he was on the side of physical force, and opposed James Cobbett's resolution that the Convention should oppose any contempt of law and confine itself to presenting the People's Petition. Cardo said that the resolution "amounted to a gagging bill," and maintained that the people "should not be dictated to."

He took a prominent part in the meeting of Chartists at Birmingham to protest against the summary and despotic arrest of Dr. Taylor. Even after his conversion he by no means gave up his Chartist friends. He brought many of them with him to the Urquhart camp. Of these one of the most valuable was Warden, a man of very different nature to himself.

Warden was the first chairman of the Metropolitan Trades Union, a society of men which had broken away from the Owenites, and whose programme combined Radical reform with a moderate amount of co-operation. William Benbow was among its members and Henry Hetherington, the editor of the *Poor Man's Guardian*, which alone reports its first meeting. This society merged into the "National Union of the Working Classes," out of which the Chartist movement sprang. Warden was the delegate for Bolton at the Convention, a man of delicate health, sensitive conscience and rich intelligence. He was first a carpenter then a gardener by trade, and for his recreation he studied the Dialogues of Plato. Warden gave in his allegiance to David Urquhart, because he it was, he said, through whom he had found the truth.

"Since the time I met with Mr. Urquhart," he wrote to Montieth six months after the opening of the campaign,

"I have been endeavouring to gain a clearer conception of the truths which were then for the first time revealed to me. My perceptions, though dim and indistinct, are sufficiently clear to convince me, that in the course we have pursued for the past two years we have been radically wrong; we have been pursuing a political phantom while England was rapidly sinking into the grave of nations. My object was (and I entered into the struggle with the most perfect self-abnegation) to restore to the working classes that privilege which they had lost, and which I conceived the other classes possessed—self-government; but I did not perceive that in losing its simplicity of character, in allowing its perceptions to be clouded by error, it had also lost the faculty of self-government as completely as the man who, having lost his eyes, has lost the faculty of sight; and that simply to add to the number of electors, when all alike were ignorant of the causes of national greatness or national decay, would only have the effect of leaving us where we were, or perhaps make our downfall more certain, since all classes from their common ignorance must have been committed to the same fatal policy."

Westrup may be called the first convert. He had been attracted to Urquhart and his friends by their views on commerce, and it was through him that the Chartists were brought in the first instance into contact with the Foreign Policy movement.

Lowery, another Chartist leader, was a Newcastle working man and a member of the Convention. He had taken part in the hard and thankless task of trying to convert Cornwall to Chartism, which never succeeded well in mainly agricultural districts. He had always been on the Law and Order side of the Convention, and in 1840 he had put forward a scheme before the meeting of delegates at Manchester for the contesting of Parliamentary seats.

Cargill gained him to the cause in the April of 1840. In July he was sent as a missionary, having earned the enthusiastic good opinion of Charles Attwood.[1] "In eloquence," said Cargill, "Lowery has always been the first man here." "Lowery is the greatest man they have,

[1] One of David Urquhart's earliest and most enthusiastic supporters, brother of Thomas Attwood, of "Birmingham Political Union" fame.

most eloquent and noble," writes Monteith in a letter asking if he shall be put up at a Glasgow meeting to oppose Collins, always an enemy to the cause. Lowery was one of the few prominent Chartists who adopted Urquhart's views and promulgated them without making enemies of his old friends. He never lost touch with Chartist movements and seems to have been a link between the Urquhart movement in Newcastle and the Northern Political Union. Cargill also succeeded in winning over Thomason, a Scotch delegate to the Convention, and at first a vehement opposer of the " Foreign Policy " men.

" I have just had," says he, " two hours' conversation with the only Chartist who opposed us on Wednesday, a man of immense influence among them, called Thomason. Perfect success ! The utmost confidence is established, and he desires to go to Glasgow to see you. He has requested from me all the publications on foreign affairs, which I have given him, and he is determined to investigate them with the deepest attention. He requested me to lend him *Turkey and Its Resources*. He begged me in particular to procure him a copy of Vattel. He is going on a tour, being chiefly actuated by the desire of laying our subjects before the people. Yet this is the man who said only on Wednesday that if any person thought to make Foreign Policy a stepping-stone to power they would find themselves horribly mistaken. ' Only the Charter !' "

Thomason made rapid progress. This letter of Cargill's is dated April, 1840. In June he wrote from Darlington, when he was on a missionary tour, to report progress. He had had two open-air meetings on Sunday, one on the Bratts near Bishop Auckland, and another on Monday just outside the town. His first glimpse at world politics had evidently been to him, as it was to so many of the working men, a passport into a wider world.

" I find," he writes, " in examining these topics that my mind is carried into the interior of a temple, of which I could form no conception, and I feel as though I could get introduced to every clime and hold intercourse with universal man. Party and its paltryisms are not worth notice when placed beside the rights of nations and the rights of man."

Side by side with Thomason's work went his studies.

"Would you be so kind as to get me two copies of the *Boundary Pamphlets*," he says. Again, in September he writes from Manchester, whither he had gone from Darlington, to ask for advice as to where he can get the *Portfolio*, the *History of Poland*, and the *Orations of Demosthenes*. His studies since May have, he says, included "twice reading Vattel, MacNeill on the East, Urquhart's *Spirit of the East*, and *Turkey and Its Resources*."

That he had not been idle anyone will admit who has read these works but once !

Last came "old Richards," who had been sent by the Convention to agitate in the Potteries for the Charter. He was on the side of Law and Order, and had tried to impress it on the operatives there, but found the conditions of labour in the Potteries so deplorable that he feared "all will be of no avail, this being the language used in these places: 'Better to die by the sword than to perish with hunger.'" No wonder, when men working fifteen hours a day found that the utmost they could earn was seven or eight shillings a week !

Richards came into the Urquhart movement under the wing of Cardo, and in spite of his age and infirmities (he was over sixty and in ill-health), he was not the least enthusiastic of the little band. At Trowbridge he reports having addressed a meeting of six hundred men in the Chartists' public room, and so interested them that they there and then formed a Committee to Investigate Foreign Policy. Bristol he visited also.

"I arrived there," he says, "about two on Saturday and after some time found some of the most intelligent of the working men there: we entered into conversation on the Foreign Policy of these kingdoms, a subject entirely new to them; they were well aware that something was wrong, but knew not what: we spent about two hours in conversation, and when I was leaving them they asked me for proof of what I had stated. I then presented them with some pamphlets, obtaining their promise to investigate for themselves and also to form a Committee to report thereon."

Such were the most prominent of the old Chartists, by whose means Urquhart and his little company of friends carried on a strenuous campaign from 1839 to 1841.

Having successfully combated in many places the Chartist danger, his one idea was to gain the mass of the working men of England to his side,[1] that together they might work for the restoration of Law and Justice at home and abroad, and so avert the peril which he was convinced threatened the safety, nay, the very existence, of England. He had with him, besides his Chartist friends, a little band of followers, whose devotion is all the more touching when we realise, as we must, that Mr. Urquhart was an extraordinarily difficult, sometimes impossible, leader. His demands on the time, health and money of his friends were immense and unceasing, and could only have been borne by those who realised to the full how much more than he exacted he was prepared himself to give.

With a really tender and sensitive disposition he could be as hard as steel. His great and piercing intelligence was absolutely intolerant of stupidity or of want of agreement on points which, because to him they were obvious, he conceived they must be so to all thinking beings.

Urquhart's aim was to establish in all the places where Chartism had been rife Associations for the Study of National and International Affairs—"Committees for the Investigation of Diplomatic Documents."

The original idea was that these committees should consist of all classes, but this project failed. The real interest evinced by the working men was not shared by the others,

[1] After the early strenuous days of the Chartist Rising, one of the first tasks to which Urquhart set himself was to try and avert the fate which hung over the unfortunate Frost, now imprisoned in Monmouth Gaol, and about to be tried for his High Treason. He was convinced that if the Government had listened to his warnings, the Newport Rising would never have taken place, and, moreover, that Frost was not responsible for it; it had been engineered secretly by a little coterie under the influence of Benyouski, and Frost had unwillingly and from a sense of loyalty to his associates been drawn into it at the last moment.

He was seconded by Westrup and Cardo. The latter went down to Wales to see what news he could gather, and was arrested at Newport, but released, as nothing could be proved against him.

to whom the distressful state of the country had never come home in the same way.

Urquhart himself was ubiquitous. He was in Liverpool one day, addressing meetings of Chartists often till two or three in the morning; the next day in Newcastle, working at the same high pressure for a week, allowing himself scarcely time to sleep or to eat; then on to Glasgow, to Sheffield or Manchester. He was always accompanied by one or more of his friends, from whom he exacted an equal amount of work.

Monteith of Carstairs wrote to Mr. Cargill about six months after the campaign had opened:

"I take advantage of a very short interval of leisure to put down a few recollections of a time which I am assured will be esteemed one of the most remarkable in the annals of England. . . . I have been present at scenes in which the select of the people have been addressed in a tone to which their ears have become utterly unaccustomed. No conciliation, no dexterous play with the passions or prejudices, no endeavouring to win by the sacrifice or even the concealment of the eternal truth. Rebuke, reproof, warning have been the instruments employed, and the results have been invariably interest, humiliation, awe, submission, and the promise of zealous co-operation.

"In consequence of the course adopted at Glasgow it became possible to do more in a week at Newcastle than during the previous weeks already mentioned.

"A committee of investigation into the state of the country and the crimes of the Foreign Minister[1] has been appointed there, remarkable not only for the subject of its labours, but for the elements of which it is composed. Classes hitherto in a state of rancorous hostility are there linked together, operatives and merchants sit together at the same table, conning over the same papers and espousing the same convictions. . . . Hence Carlisle, the next scene of our labours, was won at a single meeting of about three hours, a meeting at which the principal popular leader was not only dethroned before his followers but compelled to

[1] Lord Palmerston. Urquhart and his followers were convinced that Palmerston, in many matters of foreign policy, had acted as Russia's tool. His connection with the Princess Lieven aroused the suspicion that he was not always an unwilling tool.

leave the room as unworthy of information and instruction, while they were retained and made allies in a new cause. The operatives were to have formed a committee and have agreed to visit the upper classes of all parties, to compel their attention to these subjects and to invoke their co-operation.

"At Bolton, whither we immediately proceeded, the utmost excitement had been previously raised. A large Committee consisting of operatives and merchants has been there established. A similar work was performed at Rochdale. The last scene of our labours was Birmingham, where, as is usual with places of importance, more difficulty was to be expected, more self-sufficiency of the leaders to be encountered. Notwithstanding this and the great anxiety experienced by Mr. Urquhart, the leader of popular feeling there came with four or five of his followers. The result was far beyond what I had anticipated."

The converted Chartists had become infected with the spirit of their leader. Thomason's committee at Manchester was so flourishing that it was deemed unnecessary for Mr. Urquhart to visit that town, and in the Potteries, "that hot-bed of political agitation and the centre of powerful Chartist organisations," the committee which Richards had formed had thrown itself heart and soul into the examination of the real causes of distress and their remedies. All the members asked for were papers, documents and books to aid them in their studies.

Mary Ann Grove, an energetic Chartist, the Secretary of the Women's Radical and Female Political Union of Birmingham, became a warm supporter of the Urquhart cause. Dr. John Taylor was also much impressed by an interview of his own seeking which he had with the great man. The two were brought together by the good offices of Dr. Bryce, Urquhart's friend and medical adviser ever since the Greek War days, and a sympathiser with the Chartists. We have accounts of the interview from both the actors in it.

Urquhart writes:

"I have had a conversation of nearly five hours with Dr. T. I never so shook any man. He seemed tortured, struggling between responsibility, shame and failure brought

home, and self-love and pride that linked him to a system, and the greater shame of sinking in the estimation of those he had led on. He prevented two of the secondary men from coming, and continued the same line after our conversation, yet volunteered to send a packet of letters for the men he thought of in the places I might visit. I must add that Dr. T. repeatedly asserted that bloodshed and convulsion were inevitable. The die was cast !"

The following is Taylor's account of the meeting written to a Chartist friend: "I have had four hours' conference with Mr. Urquhart. He is truly an extraordinary man, and destined to play a great part, but he has neither time nor materials for his present project. I have given him letters to men who can aid him, but I believe we have parted never to meet again."[1]

Cardo met with hearty abuse from some of his own associates: he was a "renegade," a "Tory spy," a "traitor," he had been bought. His life was more than once threatened by his old associates, and he had the additional inconvenience of being shadowed by the police as a Chartist.

The cry of "Tory, Foreign Policy humbugs" was indeed raised all over the country in proportion to the success of the little company, who, it must be said, courted abuse by making existing Chartist organisations the base of their operations, and by always being present and speaking at Chartist meetings. One working man, who introduced the subject at a Greenock Trades Union meeting, was told that he was connected with a party which was seeking to divert the people's attention from the Charter, that before the people paid attention to these doctrines they must have the power to alter them.

"Well," said this apostle, "you have not got the power, that is quite clear. You have got to get the power; it won't come to you, and knowledge upon this as on every subject will assist you in getting political power." He then proceeded to explain that in various towns there were committees of men who were so determined to understand the foreign relations of this country that they met every week

[1] This was probably the case. Dr. Taylor died in 1841.

to investigate Parliamentary documents. His opponent replied that these committees did not consist of Chartists. "On the contrary," said he, "every one of them is a Chartist." "Opposition," he remarks, "now ceased."

The success of Urquhart's pupils was largely owing to the methods he himself used for their instruction.

He always made a point of instructing them in dialectic. "The art of proving your opponent wrong," he would often say, "lies not so much in proving the strength of your cause as in exposing the weakness of his."

At the meetings and conversations he had with the operatives he usually allowed them to choose some subject on which to question him, and he, then and there, without books or papers, would enter with them into obscure points of diplomacy, would explain to them the bearing of treaties with all their secret articles, would trace out the trend of a certain line of policy and its results, with a brilliancy that a statesman might have envied, and with such simplicity that these uneducated working men could follow him and reproduce in their talk with their fellows the knowledge he had given them.

"Yesterday," wrote Colonel Pringle Taylor, "several gentlemen dined with Mr. Urquhart and, in the evening, about six operatives waited upon him, and several gentlemen. Being much exhausted by the labours of the day and the conversation at dinner, which was very effective indeed, he confined himself to three-quarters of an hour in addressing the party after dinner. Having requested Mr. Richards, the leader of the operatives at Hanley in the Potteries, to name a subject, the Blockade of Mexico was selected.

"He showed the violation of International Law in that blockade, and the collusion of the Foreign Secretary in promoting it to the injury of British commerce; he pointed out that the operatives employed in manufactures, if the loss in wages were divided among them all, had each lost thirty shillings by the blockade; that besides, Russia had at least benefited by it in the sum of £700,000, which had principally come out of the pockets of the operatives of this country; that the merchants who had appealed against it had done so in a manner which had strengthened instead

of weakening the action of the traitorous Foreign Secretary; that the nation, and certainly all the operatives, had submitted uncomplainingly to the injury inflicted on them; that their apathy and indifference was criminal and must tend to the downfall of the State; that this was only one of many similar acts destructive of their interests and ruinous to the nation; that if they had any regard for themselves and the condition of their families, if they had any sense of the duty of man to man, if they were not entirely degraded and infamous as men and as citizens, they would apply themselves to the investigation of these matters and save their country from that annihilation which otherwise was inevitable.

"The exposition was admirable, the appeal powerful; it is impossible to give even a feeble representation of it, and still more so to convey the powerful impression produced upon all present. A gentleman present, highly connected, a Whig, hitherto an opponent, said he would give £1,000 to get Mr. Urquhart into Parliament. Mr. Charles Attwood spoke of Mr. Urquhart as an apostle, and said he never could have believed that any man was given such power. The effect on the operatives was no less astounding; they have gone forth to act day and night in awakening their fellow-men to a knowledge of what they have learnt, to an appreciation of the wonderful man they have seen, and to the conviction that through him alone can the nation be saved not merely from dangers of an appalling nature, but from annihilation and horrors which it has not hitherto entered into their minds to imagine.

"A Central Committee has been formed in London to communicate with the several provincial committees which have been formed, and the attention which is being given to the subject in London is so rapidly extending, and producing such powerful effect upon men's minds that the result can no longer be doubtful."

CHAPTER V

THE ASSOCIATIONS FOR INVESTIGATING FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND ENGLAND'S RELATIONS WITH FRANCE

In the autumn of 1840 arose the crisis between England and France brought about by the exclusion of France from the concert of the Powers on the Eastern Question. Obviously this insult to France was due to the influence of Russia, who had seen in the French support given to Mehemet Ali an opportunity for breaking up the Entente Cordiale of the Western Powers against the autocracies of the North and Centre which was formed in 1830.

Russia's plan to create a breach between England and France met with no obstacle from the two Powers themselves. M. Thiers was carrying on a crooked and underhand policy in the East, and Lord Palmerston not only disliked the French, but had an extreme personal antipathy to Louis Philippe.

It was therefore without difficulty that the Russian Cabinet succeeded in arranging that in the Conference of the Powers to deliberate upon measures to be taken against Mehemet Ali, France should be ignored.

England and France had been allies for the past ten years, and France naturally looked upon this action as a deadly insult, as indeed it was. Preparations for war were begun, and her fury was not diminished when the Russian Fleet was allowed to pass the shores of England and France on her way from the Baltic to the Mediterranean; she rightly conceived it to be a demonstration against herself.

David Urquhart took the line that it was an unjustifiable breach of the Law of Nations,[1] and a cleverly laid scheme

[1] Because it was a breach of the Treaty of July, 1839, whereby England, France, Austria and Russia were pledged always to act together at the Porte.

on the part of Russia to bring about a war between England and France during which she might carry out, without opposition, her designs on the Porte.

The Treaty was signed on July 15th. England's share in it was entirely due to the influence of Lord Palmerston, who had threatened to place his resignation in Lord Melbourne's hands unless his very unwilling colleagues agreed to it.

The whole matter, the action as well as the manner of its doing, was calculated to wound France in her most vulnerable points. And M. Thiers declared that the last franc and the last drop of the blood of France would be expended to avert the consequences of the Treaty. This was tantamount to a threat of war, and war Urquhart was most anxious to avert. To this end he determined that the people of England should communicate directly with the people of France, to make it clear that the Treaty was merely a concern of their respective Governments, that the English people were against it and were determined if possible to avert its consequences. He published a manifesto to the committees formed for the examination of diplomatic documents. He published pamphlets, wrote letters to the newspapers, held public meetings, and finally with some of his friends and three of the operatives on his committees, Lowery, Thomason and Thomas, went on a deputation to Paris. The crisis, if it did nothing else, showed the sincerity of the men who followed Urquhart, and it gained him adherents, while at the same time it augmented the hostility of his enemies.

The *Morning Post* was full of ridicule. The Chartist *Northern Liberator*, however, always more or less sympathetic, warmly espoused his cause. All the missioners were summoned to the North, and a great public meeting was held, which it reports at great length. At Carlisle two large meetings were held within a week, at which Richards, Cardo and Warden spoke. Richards was particularly happy in the line he adopted. He began by a declaration of the importance of a just Foreign Policy, but was interrupted with a question, "What about the Charter?"

He answered that he was a democrat. He went a lot farther than many Chartists. The cause of liberty throughout the world was progressing. But there was a party in England and throughout the world to prevent the spread of democratic institutions. There was Russia, there was Prussia, and Austria was stepping into the shoes of Prussia. At a time like the present, when liberty was stretching out her hands to lay hold of the prize, at that moment the Foreign Minister offends a friendly Power, and links himself with the despotic Powers. What was the union with the despotic Powers for? To bring about a war between England and France when our commerce was barely sufficient to support our operatives, and war with France would throw millions out of employment. He wanted the Charter quite as much as that gentleman who called out, and would maintain it, and if necessary fight for it.

Cardo thereupon proposed a resolution:

"That those who had hitherto had the management of affairs, from the Cabinet to the Electoral Body, were alike guilty of the betrayal of their trust, and that therefore the only hope of safety left to the nation was in the people understanding and obtaining the management of their own affairs by securing the full enjoyment of the principles contained in the People's Charter."

The success of this meeting was such that another was held, this time in the theatre, which was filled. At this Warden spoke. He said the Treaty of July was the renewal of a war against freedom in France, Turkey, Poland and Circassia. He proposed a resolution:

"That it is the opinion of this Meeting that the Treaty between Russia, Prussia, Austria and England is a Treaty to promote and forward Russian influence and aggression: that the possession of the Dardanelles and the Caucasus will give Russia a dangerous preponderance: that this Meeting is of the opinion that Lord Palmerston is a Traitor to his country, that he has betrayed his colleagues and injured his native land. And this Meeting is of opinion that the House of Commons injures the interests of the British Empire, and they pledge themselves to do all in their power to bring about a complete reform in that House."

A curiously modern interlude took place at this meeting which, in spite of a little opposition, Warden carried with

him. An opponent inquired why so much fuss was made of Poland and Circassia, whereas nothing was said about Ireland.

Warden replied that Ireland was on exactly the same footing as Poland and Circassia, but that was no reason why she should be dragged into an unjust war.

At a meeting in Birmingham Charles Attwood spoke to 25,000 people.

But it was Newcastle which took up the question most warmly.[1] The Newcastle Committee for Investigating Foreign Affairs joined with the town to send Charles Attwood, Thomas Doubleday, Horn, Grey, Gilmour and Loutit charged with a petition to M. Thiers, under the following instructions:

"Your chief duty is to make known to the People, the King, and the Cabinet of France the earnest desire of the People of England to cement more firmly the feelings of friendship and sympathy which we feel towards the French People.

"You will endeavour to convince the French People that the English People see in the complications arising out of the Treaty of July 15 no justifiable cause whatever for the interruption of peace between the two countries.

"You will therefore impress on the French Government the absolute necessity, which is incumbent on it, for our common security, to protest instantly and decidedly against the Treaty as an act of outrage on the Law of Nations in general, and of danger to our two nations in particular.

"You will take pains to impress on the French Government that it is the interest and therefore the imperative duty, not only of England and of France, but of the rest of Europe to secure the independence of Turkey, Circassia, Persia, and Sweden from the aggressions of Russia.

"It will be your duty to impress upon the French People the unanimous feeling of the people of England that the people of France and England and all the Governments party to the Treaty of Vienna, require the full and unconditional restoration of the Independence of Poland.

"The passage of a Russian fleet from the Baltic to the

[1] The *Northern Liberator* (October and November, 1840) gives full particulars of the public meeting and speeches as well as the history of the deputation and its doings in Paris.

Mediterranean would constitute a distinct attack on the maritime power of England.

"In conclusion it is desired by order of the Committee that you co-operate by all the means in your power in the patriotic exertions of Mr. Urquhart, our respected fellow-countryman, to avert the blow that is being prepared and the danger that is suspended over our country, of which the hostility of France will be the signal, and the destruction of both the consequences of its fall."

Lowery was elected at a large public meeting to represent the town: Thomas and Thomason were sent to represent the working classes. They arrived at Paris on November 13, and on the 15th Lowery wrote to the Chairman of the Committee for Investigating Foreign Affairs:

"We arrived here on Friday night. On our way here we endeavoured to sound the feelings of the French people and found them in some instances under the war mania—but mainly disposed to a friendly connexion with England; yet they appeared at a loss to understand how, if we were disposed to continue the French Alliance, we had allowed the Treaty of July to be sanctioned. We pointed out to them that the Treaty was the Act of the Minister—that he was a Traitor—and never had we a better opportunity of seeing how the systematic arrangements of falsehood and diplomatic treachery were calculated to attain their objects; here were people, whose ardent desire was to consider their neighbours as friends, yet by the fraudulent management of a Minister of England, were impressed with the belief that the people of England were their enemies.

"Yesterday we had an interview with M. Faucher, Editor of the *Courier Français*. I explained to him the nature of the Meeting at Sunderland, by which I was deputed, and the resolutions that were passed repudiating the Treaty of the fifteenth of July, and expressing their esteem for and desire of Alliance with the people of France. He expressed wonder that there had not been more meetings than there had been on the subject, and thought that Sir William Molesworth had had more influence than Mr. Attwood; we showed that he laboured under a mistake and that the subject was more generally entertained than they in France thought—that Mr. Attwood from my knowledge of the people of England (which was general) had a larger share of popular influence than Molesworth and that

coming from Newcastle lately I could assure him that the calumnies of the Whig and Tory Press, as to Mr. Attwood not representing the feeling of the people of that district, were unfounded. That there had been a large public meeting there lately commending the proceedings of Mr. Attwood. M. Faucher then reverted to Mr. Urquhart and Mr. Attwood, saying he thought the Treason of Lord Palmerston had better been kept out of their proceedings here, that it was purely an English question and did not forward their views here on maintaining the French Alliance—we showed it was only by the French understanding the Treason of Lord Palmerston that they could understand our true position and their own, that his intentions could only be explained by his acts, which were calculated to destroy the power and influence of England and render her prostration subservient to Russian Aggrandisement to place us in collision with France and weaken both her and us, and thus make the only two European Kingdoms that might stand as barriers to her usurpations and aggressions, the destroyers of each other and the instruments of her advancement. M. Faucher expressed his pleasure at our visit and his desire to extend our objects, yet he is in a fettered condition being a great admirer of M. Thiers.

"To-day we have waited on M. de Tocqueville, also Mr. Cavanah the Editor of the *National ;* after explaining my mission, M. de Tocqueville appeared to think the treachery of Palmerston plain, as connected with his conduct to the Persian Embassy, and agreed with me that it was folly to consider the Treaty of the fifteenth of July as aught but calculated to injure England and that it was the act of the Minister and not of the people; he expressed his pleasure at our mission and his hopes that the effects of the Treaty would be averted and its aim destroyed, also he said that he would assist us in any way in which he could be useful. The conversation with the Editor of the *National* was, of course, similar to the above. I told him my knowledge of the feelings of the mass of the English people from moving extensively among them, and that it was anti-Russian and well disposed to France and that the Treaty was the work of a Russian agent, Palmerston; we pointed out Mr. Cargill's pamphlet and he agreed with it, also that England and France had the same interests. I told him that this feeling was extending fast in England, and that from the exertions of Mr. Urquhart the people were entertaining and investigating the subject; he expressed his pleasure at these things,

and said that he would forward my views for producing a good understanding and mention my mission in his paper.

"To-day also we met General Charnowski, a Polish general and naturalised Englishman, just returned from Constantinople; when there he was offered the command of the Turkish army in Syria or in Egypt and refused. He was sent to Lord Ponsonby by the English Government. We explained to him how we thought that not only Poland but England and France could be saved, namely, by understanding each their true position, and acting accordingly. He agreed with us, but appears to have lost hope, he says that the Treaty of the fifteenth of July will have a bad effect on Circassia, as representing England as friendly to Russia and fears they will be worn out. He also says the war feeling is rising in Germany against France—thus are the Russians succeeding everywhere by invidious means and hired traitors: hoping soon to see these means destroyed,

I remain,
Yours,
Robert Lowery."

On November 17 he writes again to the Chairman of the Central Committee in London.

"Since I wrote last we have been extremely busy from morning until night, visiting those whom we thought might be useful in assisting to further our object, we have seen several members of the Chamber and expect to get introduced to a number of others, and as all honest men would be loath to think a man, entrusted with the destinies of his country, could be guilty of such crime and wickedness, until they examined the facts, we pointed out the series of consecutive acts committed by him, all tending to destroy the honour and influence of his country, in which he had in every instance forwarded the objects of the Russian Government; all admitted that such had been the consequences of those acts, and owned that we had sufficient reasons for affirming his guilt.

"Everyone we have spoken with has expressed his pleasure at our Mission and agreed that a war between England and France will be destructive to the interests of both countries, and that the only way to stop it is to get the people of each nation to speak out in condemnation of the Treaty and of their desire of alliance; this, of course,

is more particularly necessary for England to do, as the intelligent of the French are very desirous of our alliance.

"The last note of Lord Palmerston has had a most pernicious effect here, all men of all parties consider it an intended insult, designed to produce hostility. Le Comte de Noë, whom we visited to-day informed us that it had caused amendments to be made in the King's speech, giving it a firmer and more warlike tone.

"The nobleman, spoken of above, is decidedly convinced of the truth of our views, and Mr. Fyler was very glad to learn so, for when he had called on him he appeared to hesitate to admit them. He, the Comte de Noë, informs me that to his knowledge there has been for the last two years a number of persons travelling in our Indian possessions as French travellers, who were nothing else but Russian agents, whose purpose was to view our military stations, and to sound the feelings of the inhabitants, and scatter the seeds of revolt.

"M. Cabet, a member of the Chamber, whom we visited to-day promised to procure me some introductions to some of the intelligent working men, hitherto we have not been able to get access to them, except by mixing in the cafés and entering into conversation on the subject, which we have done very often, and have then left some copies of Mr. Attwood's address to the French Nation.

Yours, etc.,
ROBERT LOWERY."

Urquhart himself was engaged in the diplomatic circles he knew so well. He evidently did not find them improved during the five years he had been absent from them, judging from the following extract from his journal of September 4:

"I went out with Mr. Porter and M. Faucher to Auteuil. I had never seen M. Thiers. He received me well. About ten minutes elapsed before dinner was announced, during which he several times came towards me, and after a word or two went away again, showing an anxiety to enter into conversation, and still as if there was something that restrained him. I constantly found his eyes fixed upon me when I turned. I heard Madame Thiers remark to Mr. Porter, 'Votre gouvernement est aujourd'hui tout-a-fait Russe.' I expected from this, alliance in that quarter. We went to dinner about a dozen. I was beside Madame Thiers and M. Thiers opposite, found Madame Thiers perfectly

'inabordable.' M. Faucher was on the other side, and he told me as we sat down at table that M. Thiers had asked him if they could not manage to get me to talk to them about the East. I, therefore, thought that the time of dinner would be employed in some degree usefully. I never heard a conversation at a dinner-table so thoroughly contemptible, and took no part in it but a simple reply when specially addressed. On retiring after dinner M. Thiers immediately came to me, but was called off once or twice by the arrival of intelligence (popular movements), and finally led me into a gallery where we conversed. Until we got into conversation, whether after or before dinner, I had avoided the subject; accepted none of the openings made by M. Thiers either as to continuing conversation or as to directing conversation. I left him the full labour of extracting every point, and responsibility of adopting every subject. After dinner I think he commenced with saying, with a smile: 'Very different is the position of poor Ministers in France to your fine gentlemen in England; we hear that all your Ministers are killing game, and that there is not one in London'; and something followed this which pointed directly to Lord Palmerston.

"I immediately replied that he had to look to the cause of this different state of things in the great difference between the system of government in England and France, running over the different departments of Ministers in France, and showing that nothing of the kind existed in England, no functions to perform—for instance, Instruction, Justice, Police, Interior.

"M. Thiers did not seem to like the tone I took, but to be interested with my thoughts, and said: 'But the Public Affairs of the State, whatever the difference internally, require at least some care in England as in France.' I said that I believed a great deal more care had been given to these things in England than in France. An expression of surprise led me to distinguish between care and the object for which that care was given, and between interest, which was general, and attention which might be individual I then sketched the causes of the loss of the sentiment of nationality in England, the unappreciation of every man born in England of the commonest subject understood by every Frenchman, described the difference which I felt myself in Paris and in London, and consequently the different responsibility attached to France compared with England from her power of comprehending, without effort

and without assistance, what no unassisted Englishman could by any possibility comprehend. Here he moved towards the other room and returned.

"He then asked me in a formal manner what I conceived the opinion in England is, or would be, in regard to present transactions. I said: 'The opinion in England is not divided, it is nothing or it is good—that is to say, that the mass of the nation is wholly indifferent and dead, and the few who are acting are all acting in one sense.' He said: 'And what will those who are acting be able to accomplish?' I said I could not answer that without taking a given term, that if the events pressed on with rapidity as I expected they would, that opinion in England would effect nothing, but the nation would be compromised and committed, that whatever might be done afterwards, the evil that would be effected would be irrevocable. I entered then into a general explanation in reference to the estimate I formed of the different classes in England. I further gave him the conclusions at which I had arrived regarding the danger, the cause of it, and the means of safety. He said, stopping, and with great slowness and gravity: 'Be assured that every means within the disposition of France—that every resource which she possesses—that every arm that belongs to her will be employed and will perish, before France will submit to the dishonourable and dangerous conditions that are sought to be placed upon her.' My reply was in the same tone: 'Be assured that all the resources and power and strength and energy of France will be of no avail. It is not by material means that the danger comes, nor by the arm, but by the head that it is to be averted.' I then sketched the progress of inter-distraction between the Powers of Europe, the object of Russia in arming France for the accomplishment of her design. He stopped a second time, and after a pause, which left me in some doubt whether he was preparing to oppose or to assent, he said: 'I feel indeed that all our differences and our struggles are heedless and insane, and that a fearful overflow awaits Europe. I have often thought,' he added, 'that we were much in the position of Athens in the face of Philip.' I said: 'If you feel that, these consequences will not follow, no Minister of Athens dreaded them.' At this moment I conceived every end within reach. It died away—he followed nothing to a conclusion, received coldly my statement regarding the ignorance of the Public Men of France and his own of matters without which he could

not judge of the position of England and Russia, consequently of the diplomatic relations of the world, and the spirit of the conversation was lost from that point where he had come to the assertion of so solemn a resolution, as if it was a thing to overwhelm me, and when he accepted my counter declaration, not feeling that if he accepted it the whole of what he was saying was vain and useless. We returned after some time to the saloon, where our friends, I saw, were anxiously awaiting the result. The only answer to the inquiries made me which I gave was 'tant soit peu content.' He immediately after this sat down in an arm-chair, and when I observed him next he was sound asleep !"

Urquhart left nothing undone that might help on his designs. He conversed at much length with M. Mignet, the historian of the French Revolution.

"I never saw a man more powerful than M. Mignet," he says, "in common-place. . . . I can quite conceive that any man living *en famille* with M. Mignet must be incapable of action. If I lived three days with him I should only be fit for Bedlam."

He visited the various French Ministers and the diplomatic representatives of the different countries.

One most interesting visit, which he describes at great length, was to M. Coletti, the Greek Minister,[1] who had known him in his early days in the East and had the most profound faith in him.

"My sole hope," said the old man when he saw him, "was in England, knowing you were there, but I had begun to despair, because I had expected long and waited long."

He had an interview with the agent of the Pasha of Egypt, Mehemet Ali:

"I drove in the Bois de Boulogne to see M. Nuber, whom I found very much restored; he detailed to me the preparations for an insurrection in Asia Minor, and I concerted with him that he was immediately to write a letter to the

[1] Coletti was Governor of Samos after the Greek War of Independence, and Urquhart studied Greece under his guidance. "He was," said he, "the only man of outstanding merit whom the Greek Revolution had produced. He was the constant opponent of Capodistras and the Russophile party."

Prime Minister of the Porte, exposing to him his position, and a similar letter to Mehemet Ali. He is to bring the drafts of the letters here on Sunday morning; he is, notwithstanding the position he occupies, a man who for many years has laboured in every way, not merely to give me support, but to obtain for me instruction. He is an Armenian, a brother-in-law of Bogos Bey, the Prime Minister in Egypt. He thought he had explained to himself the conduct of Lord Palmerston, by supposing that the object of England in this matter was jealousy of the French navy, and to create a collision for its destruction. I had but the day before learnt the (if it is possible to suppose one fact more damning than another) damning fact, that the augmentation of the French navy in 1836 had been at the request of Lord Palmerston. This I mentioned to him, and he staggered (we were walking at the time) as if a blow had been dealt upon his breast."

Urquhart and his party were, moreover, in constant communication with M. Odilon Barrot, the Leader of the Left in the French Chamber under the Thiers Government. He was entirely sympathetic, and had several interviews with the English deputation. He had arranged a public banquet for them, when the Thiers Ministry fell. The King, evidently in a panic, called M. Guizot to the Presidency of the Council, and the French Government declared its readiness to subscribe the Treaty of July 15. This being so, the danger of a war was averted, and any public demonstration became inexpedient, more especially if the presence of the deputation had been at all concerned in the volte-face.

Though Urquhart had done his best to avert a war between France and England, his last wish was that France should meekly accept the Treaty. "Her way of escape," he said, "was not war, but protest."

"This," said M. Odilon Barrot, who was waited upon by the deputation, accompanied by several members of the Chamber, "would not be appreciated by the people. If any public demonstration took place, they would not know how to distinguish between the sympathy between the peoples and the impending alliance of the Governments, which means dishonour to France."

The banquet, however, took place at M. Barrot's house, where eighty members of the French Chamber met the English deputation.

So ended the only important piece of international work undertaken by these young committees. After 1841 they gradually died out. Urquhart probably felt discouraged in face of the indifference which he found everywhere prevailing, and the small headway he seemed able to make against it. His time and attention were taken up in a thousand other directions, and he did not bestow on them the care that such immature societies needed.

One or two friends in whom he placed confidence proved themselves unworthy, and grossly mismanaged the business arrangements with which Urquhart refused to concern himself. The missionaries were sent from town to town, and left there without regular supplies of money being sent for their necessary expenses.

Heartrending letters came from the poor men, left to themselves without money, and anxious about wives and families also left, they much feared, in great straits. That in spite of such inconvenience they remained faithful is sufficient proof how strong a hold the cause had on their minds and affections. Certainly there was no pecuniary inducement for their loyalty, though Fergus O'Connor accused "the anti-Russo, anti-Chartist" party of trying to buy off Chartists "at anything from £3 to £5 a week." The unsatisfactory state of the financial arrangements of the little company, however, necessitated the missionaries returning to their daily labour. Some of them grew despondent when the great hopes with which the campaign started seemed to fail and efforts relaxed. Lowery, writing from Kirkcaldy in July, 1841, says:

"After I wrote you last I waited till April in the hope that I would have heard of some attempts of our friends to set themselves in motion on the subject of foreign relations, but hearing nothing from the South of Mr. Urquhart coming northwards, and never having had a line from Mr. Cardo or Mr. Warden on it, and from the desponding manner

in which Mr. Cargill spoke, I concluded that those arrangements spoken of as being intended had been considered impracticable, and had been abandoned."

Mr. Urquhart himself says, writing in 1850, of the movement:

"The way I pointed out has not been walked in. I had then minds in action, but minds can be brought into action, or have hitherto at least only been brought into action by vain speculation. The excitement failing, stolidity returned. The convulsion of England was spared; that is all."

As a matter of fact the apparent failing of the movement was just as much due to himself as its earliest success. He did not succeed in gaining the mass of the working men to his side, because he was always expecting them to see things from his point of view. He never realised that he was up on the heights and saw the whole of Europe, and more than Europe, America and the East also, and that therefore he could see remote and far-reaching causes, while they could only see those that lay within their low and narrow vision. *He* might see that it was international injustice which was the ultimate cause of national distress, that it was England's subservience to Russia and arrogance to Turkey which made prices high and wages low, but the only causes *they* could see were the selfishness of the upper and middle classes and the Corn Laws. *He* might be able to lay his finger on the weak spot in British Government, and say: "If your Ministers were responsible to the King and people the danger of injustice would be lessened." *They* only saw in the King, as in the Ministers, the representative of a hated system. The Charter and Universal Suffrage, class-war against an oppressing class bounded their vision. They could see no other way of getting right and justice done.

This point of view Urquhart not only did not understand, but would not try to understand.[1] Like a prophet of old he denounced it, unsparingly, fiercely, whenever it was presented to him. To men who came to interview him,

[1] His position seems to have been justified by the eventual death of the Chartist movement.

prepared to uphold it and fight for it against him, he would have nothing to say. He dismissed them, often with contumely, always with contempt. These were evil counsels, things that must be put away without compromise. This attitude of his, while it increased the admiration of his friends, gave enormous advantage to his enemies, and seriously restricted the number of those who followed him.

He seized the eager, speculative and enthusiastic minds like Cardo's, or the intelligent philosophical lover of abstract reason like Warden; he attracted daring men like Thomason, who guessed at possibilities lying beyond their opportunities of knowledge, by his glowing dreams of a future, when righteousness and peace should possess the earth, following in the wake of justice, and bringing prosperity in their train. He stimulated their intellect by his knowledge and intelligence, he awakened their consciences by his hatred of evil, he thrilled their imaginations by his glowing oratory; the strength of his personality held them while they were with him, but sometimes, when they were outside the magic circles of his presence, they began to see that they had been carried along by him, and they did not recognise the path by which they had come. If they were prepared to study long and arduously, they generally found him out to be as they said, "absolutely right," and their admiration became almost worship. But these were the finer minds. The lesser ones often withdrew from him if they were sincere, or yielded to that subtle form of falsehood, which he himself denounced most fiercely, the profession of opinions to which they had not themselves arrived. But where Urquhart failed he failed grandly. A lesser man would have met the men on their own grounds of Charter and Suffrage, and led them on. Not so Urquhart. The Charter and Suffrage, he said, were based on meanness and selfishness. They were just as much party cries as any Whig or Tory shibboleths. He would not use them even for a jumping-off ground into the deep seas of Liberty and Justice.

He destroyed all he held to be evil so thoroughly and recklessly that he often tore down foundations on which good might have been built.

But although the movement which had begun with such high hopes died down for a time, Urquhart's friends did not therefore count him to have failed. His mission was too high to be within the reach of failure. In their eyes he could not fail ultimately. They were ready to follow him wherever he went, and to share with him whatever came. So it was now; so it was at the end of a long life, when to Attwood, Monteith and Ross, as well as to a host of younger disciples, he was still the " Bey " of early days. But then he had become also a prophet, for by that time he had substantiated in their eyes his claim to be " always right."

This passionate, and as it seems sometimes, exaggerated worship of David Urquhart by his friends is quite incomprehensible if we look upon him as a leader of a political party. That he never was. He was always a preacher of righteousness; of righteousness where it has been hitherto left out by the modern world—*i.e.*, in matters of statecraft.

It was as a preacher of righteousness that they followed him. Whomsoever he attached to him, whether working men, merchants, women, Catholic priests, he first converted. Their entry into his sphere of influence was like the entry into the Kingdom of Heaven; it involved a new birth into Justice. Old things must be put away, henceforth all things must become new.

Selfish individualism in religion, sloppy piety, empty formalism died away under his teaching, and there rose up in his followers a sense of fellowship, a joy in the annihilation of self, and a willingness to put aside any self-interest in the common work for the salvation of the State and the regeneration of mankind.

CHAPTER VI

THE FORMATION OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEES

"Look up! Look up!
O Citizen of London, enlarge thy countenance.
O Jew, leave counting gold! Return to thy oil and wine.
O African! Black African! Go, Winged Thought, widen his forehead."

BLAKE: *A Song of Liberty.*

IT was not until 1854 that the Foreign Affairs Committees were revived. In 1854 also Urquhart married, and the success which attended the new Societies was in no small degree due to Mrs. Urquhart's untiring diligence and gentle courtesy. Not only did she keep things going when her husband's health broke down, as it constantly did beneath the strain of his work, but she smoothed over many difficulties, soothed wounded feelings, and held to her husband's allegiance useful men whom his faults of temper bade fair to sever from it. She threw herself into the work with the most entire self-devotion. She studied, wrote, and interviewed, spending strength which, as the years went by, she could ill spare from the cares of her household and the burden of an increasing family.

From 1847 to 1852 David Urquhart was in Parliament, but his parliamentary career was only an episode in his life. Yielding at last to the representations and entreaties of his friends, he had consented to stand for Stafford as an Independent Member, and was returned by an overwhelming majority. He entered the House with a scorn for parliamentary methods, traditions and procedure which, while it effectually secured him from falling into the parliamentary habit, at the same time prevented his gaining or wishing to gain either influence or position in the House.

DAVID URQUHART

Shortly after his marriage

To face page 121

His most important speech was on the Motion of Mr. Anstey[1] for the impeachment of Lord Palmerston as a traitor to his country. The Motion was naturally a fiasco. Even those Members of the House who were inclined to agree that Palmerston deserved impeachment had too much regard for their political career to admit it. Palmerston himself affected supreme indifference, but he bought off Anstey by offering him the appointment of Attorney-General of Hong-Kong.

Urquhart did not stand at the next General Election in 1854.

A considerable part of the fourteen years which had elapsed since his first attempt to secure the co-operation of the working men Urquhart had spent abroad trying to recover from a severe attack of illness to which he had all but succumbed in 1841. He travelled leisurely through Spain and Morocco, and revisited the East, spending six months in Mount Lebanon. His book *The Lebanon* was the result of his sojourn there.

The literary outcome of his travels in Spain and in Morocco was *The Pillars of Hercules*, one of the most interesting of his works. It is a book of travels interspersed with historical and philosophical research. In spite of much careless writing, the book is one of great value, and bears the marks of an acute and original mind.

"The narrative and descriptive parts," said William Shepperd,[2] whose opinion Mr. Urquhart had asked, "are most striking and novel. The historical and philosophical disquisitions I consider one of the most valuable contributions to modern literature; you have fallen upon the great topics of interest and curiosity, the great problems of history to which Spain is the key with the Phœnicians and Saracens. . . . Mr. Hallam, Sharon Turner, Forster and Bechman in his *History of Inventors* have all touched upon these subjects, and their data confirm your conclusions, but you alone have worked out this mine in the spirit of Niehbur, and have thrown light upon and reduced to order what has hitherto been an historical chaos."

[1] Member for Youghal, co. Waterford, v. sub. p. 143 n.
[2] Fellow of Oriel and Barrister of the Inner Temple.

The book was successful. It would probably have been more so had it not been for its twofold character. His reviewers, favourable as they were, did not understand his point of view. One thinks it "most extraordinary that Mr. Urquhart, whose books are so full of talent and originality, has not succeeded in public life." "There is good sense," said the *Daily News*, whose review occupied two columns, "in every remark he makes till he comes to politics, and then he becomes at once *déraisonable*."

But what, to the British mind, was want of common sense to him was fundamental truth. It was here that his way parted from that of most of his countrymen. In the unspoilt countries, which Europe considered had been left behind in the march of civilisation, he found what had attracted him in the East—entire indifference to what the West called progress, and a simple adherence to primitive social ideals.

This condition of things Urquhart contrasts in *The Pillars of Hercules* with the national life of modern European States, particularly of England, who, like the Church of Laodicea in the Apocalypse, boasting herself "that she was rich and had need of nothing, knew not that she was wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked."

"England thought herself to be rich," said Urquhart, "because great masses of wealth were accumulated into the hands of a few, whereas she was poor in all real wealth and was, moreover, smitten with the sore diseases of corruption and blindness. Material poverty matters little. A nation may be poor in gold and possessions and yet, like Spain and India and the East, in fact all the countries where the old traditions still linger, may be not only healthier but richer than England."

Of the condition of his own country he took, indeed, a very gloomy view. She had lost her self-government. She had lost, or was fast losing, all noble and beautiful craft. Her industries were being absorbed by factories, and domestic industry was either dying or dead.

"The country," he said, "is being run on a system that would ruin in a year any private establishment. Taxes

are levied on industry and on the necessities of life instead of on capital. Credit is pledged in advance. The mass of the people are crushed by taxation and legislation. Law and freedom are alike dead; and everyone lifts up his hands and praises our noble civilisation. . . . Matters that are of the most vital importance to every member of the community involving issues of peace and war which mean the prosperity and life or the misery and death of millions are entirely withdrawn from the control of those whom they most nearly concern, and are decided in secret by, at most, two or three highly placed officials responsible to no one for their mistakes or crimes."[1]

This was, in Urquhart's eyes, the crowning evil of the State, and in the Crimean War he saw it materialised. The sailing of the Allied Fleets to the Bosphorus was the direct result of the secret diplomacy which he traced from the proposal of the Czar Nicholas to Lord Aberdeen for the partition of Turkey, through the conversations in which again and again the same proposal was made to successive Prime Ministers, with the final offer of Egypt and Candia to England as her share of the booty, to the climax of March, 1854, when the war for which Russia had so long plotted at length broke out, "because," said Urquhart, "she was ready for it."

"Is it conceivable," he asks, "that if Sir Hamilton Seymour's despatches of January, 1853, had been read at the Council-table to an assemblage of selected public men of all parties that the English Ambassador at St. Petersburg would not have been instructed to return a reply far different to that sent ?"

A war of ignorance or collusion according to Disraeli, it was, in Urquhart's eyes, one of ignorance *and* collusion.[2]

[1] This passage occurs in a private letter, but it is in substance constantly repeated in Urquhart's writings. His social creed was most fully stated in a lecture delivered at the Philosophical Society of Portsmouth, March, 1845, on "Pauperism and its Cure." It was afterwards published as a pamphlet, under the title of *Wealth and Want.*

[2] Lord Ponsonby—*Letters on the Eastern Question*, Brighton, 1854—is quite at one with Urquhart on the folly of pretending to aid the Turks, who were perfectly able to defend themselves against the

The collusion would not have been possible but for the ignorance, and it was ignorance which, both before its outbreak and during its course, he faithfully endeavoured to dispel.

Before the appointment of the Sevastopol Commission he pointed out the imbecility of landing British troops at a port of no value, and which they could not hold, on the wrong side of the fort and exposed to all the enemy's fire, while they left unassailed the Port of Odessa, so important for Russian trade, which, thanks to the surrender by the Allies of their maritime rights, was uninterrupted. Most of the disasters of that disastrous war, he maintained, were due to secret diplomacy. Had its conduct been in the hands of the Privy Council, assembled in the constitutional manner by the Queen, Lord Palmerston's proposal to attack Sevastopol would instantly have been met by the questions:

"Why select that port?" "Why not blockade the Russian ports and so destroy her trade?" "Why do you select a strong fortress, from which no hostile expedition has ever sailed?" "And why do you leave unassailed the emporium Odessa, which has always been the base of her operations?" "Why, if you propose to attack Sevastopol, did you not propose this before that fortress was reinforced by the army retreating from Silistria?" "And why did you not propose to occupy the Isthmus of Perekop, and so cut off the reinforcing army?" Fifty other questions would have been asked; and that most ignoble, most useless, and most ghastly destruction of our army in the trenches never would have taken place.

It was in order that the nation might not be wholly destitute of those prepared to ask such questions that Urquhart set himself to reorganise the Foreign Affairs Committees in 1854.

He began in Newcastle, as he wrote some years after-

Russians. "I am sure," he says, "that if the Turks are drawn in to trust England they will ultimately be ruined.

"Let the Allies, as they call themselves, leave it to Turkey and Russia to fight the battle out. The Turks will win. They will not be defeated by Russia."

wards to the French social reformer M. Le Play, with a Committee of three, "a blacksmith, a carpenter and a blind beggar." But its numerical weakness and social insignificance was more than compensated for by the keenness and intelligence of its members. Their discussions and questions along with Urquhart's answers he afterwards embodied in a pamphlet called *Constitutional Remedies*, which served as a textbook for other Committees.

The Committees spread rapidly from town to town. Urquhart devoted a whole year entirely to their organisation. They were for the most part composed of working men, though in some of them we find merchants, shopkeepers and labourers, working side by side. In each town he collected, with the help of friends, a few men gained either by an appeal to "their curiosity, their intelligence, or their passions." He introduced them to the study of Vattel, of his own or Anstey's pamphlets on their own Constitution, on the East, and on Russia, together with Blue Books and parliamentary documents relating to their own times. As the Committees grew, he watched them carefully, and from them he selected a few men to undergo for three months a more special course of study.

"After having," he says in a letter to M. Le Play, "during the autumn of 1854 travelled all through England holding in each town meetings which varied from fifty to sixteen hundred people, I made choice of the most able men, and brought sixty of them together at Manchester. They were there for three months. During that time we had many public meetings, and made excursions to the neighbouring towns, but the object of bringing together these men, those keen and stirring spirits of the working class, was study. They were divided into sections, and their studies were directed by those who had already worked with me. They assembled at ten o'clock in the morning, and all passed through the same course of lectures on the Law of Nations and the Constitution of England. Then they divided into separate branches of these subjects, such as the Treaty of May, 1852, the Chinese and Afghan Wars, Maritime Law, the Commercial Treaty with Turkey, the Corn Supply, the Holy Alliance, Poland, etc. The hours of work were from ten in the morning till one o'clock for dinner. They re-

sumed work at two o'clock and went on till seven, when they stopped for tea. At eight o'clock all met in the same room, and I discussed with them for never less than two hours the topics on which they had been at work through the day. These men, grave, diligent, enthusiastic, were a sight worth seeing. At the end of three months there was a public meeting to which prominent statesmen, lawyers and ecclesiastics were invited. Some accepted the office of judges. The men were questioned first by one, then by all who were there. The most able of the sixty were chosen to form a deputation to London to treat with the members of both Houses of the Treaty of Denmark and the Right of Search. It was on that occasion that Lord Hardwicke's famous remark, so often quoted, was made: 'You are not working men but statesmen, or rather, you are what statesmen would be if we had any.'

"But it was not study alone by which such results were obtained. It was by training also. I put myself in the place of such and such a public man, and I made them come and make known their wishes. Then I replied as Mr. Bright would have replied, or Mr. Cobden, or any other of our enemies, Whig or Tory. Then I made them change places, taking myself that of the deputation. After their training, the deputations to London, of which there were many, gave them insight. But for that all would have been in the air. After having seen the men who from afar had seemed to them so great and so strong, they understood the words of Demosthenes: 'It is for the least among us to save the State; for the great have neglected their duty.'"

Urquhart's method was always to deal with the individual as a whole man. It was not enough for him to gain the intellectual assent of a man to his opinions. The very word "opinion" was anathema to him. Man was put into the world to exercise his judgment, and a right judgment depended on character. The man must be real through and through. He must wish to be right not to appear to be right. That was self-love, and self-love was one of the deepest passions of the human heart. Nothing could be done with a man until that was eliminated.

It was the first point that Urquhart attacked. And it was here that his hardest struggles took place. Until they

met with him his disciples looked upon their private character and thought as something entirely apart from their political and private ambitions.

What, for instance, had the passing of the Reform Bill or Universal Suffrage to do with a man's sincerity of thought or right use of words? "Everything," said Urquhart. Sincerity of thought meant that people would really wish to find out what was for the good of their country, and would be ready to lay aside any theory or plan, however cherished, which could be proved to be inimical to it. And sincerity of thought could only be reached in England by a return to the careful use of words—to a knowledge of their true meaning.

The age was corrupt; its speech insincere; its reason perverted by self-love. Before a man could be of real use he must be taken out of his age; he must put aside the self that his age had produced and become his true self; he must repudiate current modes of thought; he must use words and phrases in their true meaning, and he must renounce abstractions of every kind. The man who gave himself up to Urquhart's guidance was often brought to himself by a great shock. He was shown that he had nothing that could be called knowledge, that he was blindly following public opinions, that his theories were based on falsehood, that the Promised Land, to which by way of Suffrage, Corn Laws, and such-like paths, he was journeying was a mirage in a barren wilderness, that the road to promised lands was never by such easy paths as these, but by rocky roads up the steep mountain-sides of self-discipline and knowledge.

If he could bear the sight, if he turned and admitted his mistake, Urquhart spared no pains to show him the right way and to keep him in it. He was set to study, to learn the law that should guide nations in their relations with each other, to study the events of the time and the actions of Governments in the light of that law.

He was taught that the spirit of his age, which called itself Progress, was Retrogression. All the measures by which his fellow-countrymen thought they had advanced,

had served only to deprive them of the constitutional liberty which had belonged to their forefathers. The Reform Bill, by which the working classes thought they had gained a share in the Government, had resulted in greatly increased taxation. It had given them a right to elect their masters, but it had made their servitude more complete.

This Urquhart pointed out with great force in the handbook *Constitutional Remedies*, whose object was to show that while the Law was intended to control the actions of the Government, modern Governments were tending to become more and more centralised into what was not only an "oligarchical usurpation," taking away from the people the control they had in former days over their domestic affairs, but was depriving them of set purpose of all knowledge of Foreign Affairs. He entered into an explanation of the various institutions of Mediæval England from the Privy Council, through which the Royal functions were exercised, to the Courts Leet, showing how it was possible for these Courts of the humblest citizens to set the Law in motion by moving the Shire Courts to move the King's Council. He pointed out that the only safeguard of a State, whether monarchical or democratic, was that the people should retain and be determined to retain knowledge of their own affairs, foreign as well as domestic. He urged on the Committee-men to work as he had always done for the abolition of the Cabinet, whose growth and illegal usurpation of authority he traced from the Cabal of Charles II., on through the reign of William and Mary to its full development under the Hanoverians. There could be no security for the nation with the Government in the hands of a secret Committee. He urged them to work for the restoration of the old Privy Council. How? they said. And Urquhart's answer is the key to all his teaching. "By your own knowledge, your own sincerity, your own convictions. You can reach the convictions of other men only through your own."

"If you are convinced," he said, in effect, "that as a nation you are in a state of sin, that you are weakly and like cowards shelving responsibility, because the power of

government has been usurped by a faction, you will convince others. But if you hold it only as a political opinion, as a catchword to awaken interest, you will fail. Perhaps not at first, for opinions and shibboleths in a corrupt state of society have more power than honest conviction, and seem to override it. But ultimately the idea will die, because it is founded on nothing: it has no root or depth of earth in which to grow. A truth is a truth, and must win its way. If this thing is true, and you are true, it will win its way through you. If you are not true it will win its way in spite of you. Therefore we return to the starting point: all depends on character."

At the root of Urquhart's teaching lay a deep belief in human nature, in the power of man to be right. He sweeps away every idea that man is bound to be wrong. Indolence and indifference are the parents of such theories. Man in himself is a being with dispositions towards good, besieged in his inmost citadel by a foe, call it what you will; Urquhart called it the Spirit of the Age. From that spirit the man must free himself. Then he can think truly, judge justly, act rightly. You must not judge man by what he actually is, you must think of his undeveloped powers, those powers to which our Lord referred when He said: "Be ye therefore perfect." You must believe in the possibility of fulfilling that command, and along with your contempt for the man as he is and for yourself, in so far as you resemble him, you must have the deepest love and respect for man as he might be. For man is greater than his conception of himself.

There is in this doctrine no room left for indolence, no truce with human weakness. Man is meant to rise above human weakness. Things are not to remain wrong because we find them wrong. "Never allow yourself to think of what is, until you have thought of what ought to be." This applied, said Urquhart, both to man as an individual and to communities.

The possibilities which such a doctrine opened up to those who could receive it were illimitable. It took the working men out of their narrow lives, conditioned by sordid circumstances, out of the corruption and rottenness

of politics, out of the evils of the social state and set them in a Utopia, wherein they were pure and just dwellers in a perfect state. No wonder that with heart and mind they worked for such a consummation. Urquhart was, from his first contact with the working classes, against everything which as a class they desired. He despised the Charter, he waved aside Reform Bills, to the Corn Laws he would have nothing to say. All legislation, even the Factory Bills, he described as perfectly useless, if not actually harmful, a mere treatment of symptoms. Yet the working men whom he attracted he held, his system wrought a complete change in their character, and they worked, even as he did, for the conversion of others.

Amongst his disciples were those who had found the Charter useless; members of the O'Brienite National Reform League, Stephens, the old Chartist leader,[1] ad-

[1] Karl Marx was also a convinced adherent of Urquhart in his views on Russia and the East, and in his execration of Lord Palmerston's policy. Both were agreed in detestation of modern commercial and financial transactions, though their policy for remedying them was so different.

Spargo, in his *Life of Karl Marx*, says: "Marx gladly co-operated with David Urquhart and with his followers in their anti-Russian campaign, for he regarded Russia as the leading reactionary Power in the world, and never lost an opportunity of expressing his hatred for it. In David Urquhart he found a kindred soul to whom he became greatly attached. . . . The influence which David Urquhart obtained over Marx was remarkable. Marx probably never relied upon the judgment of another man as he did upon that of Urquhart. Nor was Marx the only German of note who acknowledged Urquhart's leadership. Lothair Bucher, later the friend and literary executor of Lassalle, and the *alter ego* of Bismarck, was another ardent disciple."

In his *Story and Life of Palmerston*, Karl Marx writes:

"This is a fitting occasion to give his due to Mr. David Urquhart, the indefatigable antagonist for twenty years of Lord Palmerston, to whom he proved a real antagonist—one not to be intimidated into silence, bribed into connivance, charmed into suitorship; while, what with cajoleries, what with seductions, Palmerston contrived to change all other foes into friends."

Strange to find in the founder of "Doctrinaire Socialism" an admirer, almost a disciple, of so passionate an upholder of Law as Urquhart!

Lothair Bucher, who had fled for his life from Germany, having been sentenced to death as a Republican, became a devoted disciple of Urquhart's.

After studying his writings and much oral instruction, his adherence to his master was completed by the accidental discovery of

herents of secularist and atheist clubs, who found their way back to religion, some even to the Catholic Church, by way of Justice and Law. One such wrote nearly twenty years later a touching account of his first meeting with David Urquhart:

"In the month of August, 1857, twenty-one men were assembled in a room over a grocer's shop in the market-place of this town (Preston). Twenty of them were Secularists (Atheists), the other a Swedenborgian. I was one of the number, being an Atheist, and the Secretary of the Society. It was a Monday night, I had learnt during the day that Mr. Urquhart was to be in the town that night. When the discussion whether a God existed or not was about to commence, I got up and, mentioning Mr. Urquhart being in the town, stated as I had read in infidel literature that he was an enemy to the freedom of the Press, opposed to both suffrage and ballot, opposed to progress and reform, and that it seemed to me that we ought all to go and take him to task and crucify him. They all agreed, and we set off in a body, exulting on the way at the prospect of our success.

"The picture in my mind of Mr. Urquhart before I saw him was that of an ugly wrinkled man with a long beard and a stupid expression of countenance. When we got into the large room where he was and arranged ourselves,

---

an almost forgotten book on *The Policy of European Cabinets*. There were scarcely any copies to be found in European libraries because, as Bucher discovered, Russia had bought them all up.

Thereupon Herr Bucher wrote a series of articles to the German papers which set all Germany by the ears.

"In every beer-shop and tavern," says Edward Fischel, "most energetic controversies were carried on respecting the letters of Bucher."

"These articles in which the English Ministers were represented as the accomplices of Russia caused the greatest excitement. . . . To one party Herr Bucher seemed like a Bedlamite, or a hypochondriac, while to the other he appeared as the unshrinking champion of Truth."

For whatever cause, however, it was worth Bismarck's while to stop Bucher's pen. He was bought off; nothing was said about the sentence of death passed upon him in 1848.

He returned to Germany as Bismarck's secretary, and soon became known as the only person fully in the great Chancellor's confidence.

"He is a sort of 'Frère Joseph,'" said the Berlin correspondent of the *Pall-Mall Gazette*, "notorious as the only man who has his master's full confidence, and as much hated as he is dreaded."

sitting in a semi-circle before him, I began to feel uneasy. The picture of him in my mind was false. He was not old, nor ugly, nor wrinkled, nor stupid-looking. His eye was steady, clear and fearless, and there was an expression on his face that seemed to say that he knew us, and meant to turn us inside out. When we asked him if he would help us to get votes he said he would help us to get knowledge, and asked us if we would give a child a razor. . . .

"Mr. Urquhart, in the course of his remarks, spoke on the necessity of friendship between England and France, and had been giving some instances of how the peace between the two countries had been endangered by diplomatic means. My friend, the Swedenborgian, began: 'But don't you think that the amount of trade that is done between England and France will be a great security for the peace of the two countries; that France buying so much from England and selling so much to England must have the effect of cementing the peace of the two countries?'

"The answer of Mr. Urquhart was terrible, at least to me at the time. . . . The point in his denunciation that was the most powerful was the showing that the Swedenborgian's union of nations was a mere question of huckstering, buying and selling, and not the basing the relations of England and France on justice, without which man cannot even buy and sell. I saw all this when Mr. Urquhart burst out with the indignant words, 'You huckster! you shopkeeper!' and advanced to the man with clenched hands and set teeth, and called him blind, and said that he and those like him were the leaders of the people. He spoke to us of India, telling us what was coming even then. But it is rather the effect on myself than the actual words that I remember now. My eyes were not only opened, but opened very wide. I looked on my past life as a blank, and from that hour to this I have made some endeavour to redeem the past. I have generally found some few men to work with me. First of all we got five of the members who heard Mr. Urquhart, and shortly after the Secular or Atheistic Society broke up."

William Singleton, the writer of this letter, worked his way from the Atheistical Society to the Catholic Church. But the beginning of good to him was this interview with Mr. Urquhart, when the fierce denunciations which seemed calculated to repel drew the finer spirits to him. This was

part of Urquhart's method. "There is no art I have practised so assiduously as the faculty of making men hate me," he says. "That removes apathy. You can get them into speech. Then you have their words to catch and hurl back at them to knock them down with."

Many distinguished men bear witness to the success of his method.

"It is you," said Père Gratry, on being introduced to him, "who tamed the democracy of England." Lothair Bucher profited by Urquhart's knowledge of diplomacy, if not by his principles. Dr. Fischel used what he had taught him in his work on the Constitutional History of England. Mr. A. G. Stapleton,[1] who spent a day with one of the Committees, was overwhelmed with the men's knowledge and high moral standard.

"There is nothing these men did not know on international relations; all the treaties and their stipulations, on what occasions they were made, how they had been carried out, all their bearings as affecting the past, and their probable effect on the future, were dealt with as if they had spent their lives in the Foreign Office. Every point of our Foreign Policy was dealt with, and they showed equal knowledge on all.

"The object for which these men had banded themselves together was of the noblest. . . . 'Sir,' they said, addressing me over and over again in the course of the discussion, to which they came in their dinner-hour in working clothes and arms all stained with the indigo they were using for their dyes, 'our object is to compel our Government to re-establish the reign of Law.' Such was the lofty ideal which filled the minds of these lowly mechanics. I retired from the conference with mingled feelings of amazement and delight, and thought that no one need despair of England's fate while such men formed a portion of her people."[2]

John Stuart Mill had an equally high opinion of their character and aims. He called Urquhart's disciples "the élite of the people of England." He told a deputation of working men who came to interview him that he had been

[1] The intimate friend and biographer of George Canning.
[2] A. G. Stapleton, *A Day with One of the Committees*.

a college friend of Urquhart's in their youth. They had then had antithetical views on most matters, but now there were few subjects on which he did not agree with him.

After reading with great appreciation a letter of David Rule, a Newcastle plasterer and plumber, he remarked that the most gratifying thing about David Urquhart's work was "the development of mind among the working classes."

It must be remembered that Urquhart chose out for treatment the best of the working men.

"Do not waste your time upon inferior men," he said to a meeting of his working-men disciples; "you must find a certain amount of natural intellectual power to make a man worth talking to. If a man is not simple and child-like so as to have escaped the fallacies of his age, he must have a mind capable of sufficient intellectual effort to grapple with them."

It is not possible to read the records of the men of the Foreign Affairs Committees without contrasting them with the working men of to-day, rather, it must be admitted, to the disadvantage of the latter.

Those men, without half the advantages of the working men of our own times, seem to have been, in character and morale, head and shoulders above them. They had no education except what they got for themselves. They had been put to work at a barbarously early age. Their hours of work were long, often twelve hours a day. Their food was dear and of very poor quality. Their homes were unsanitary, often mere hovels. There were no working-men's clubs. Books and papers were dear, cheap editions almost unknown. The state of labour was disturbed. Wages were low and unemployment common. But the leading note in the men of the Committees was self-forgetfulness and devotion to the cause of their country. During the American Civil War, the time of the Committees' greatest activities, quite half the mills in the cotton districts were closed, and the rest were on half time. Three and sixpence a week was a common wage for a family.

Yet, in spite of their own sufferings, the men of the Foreign Affairs Committees signed and took round petitions

THE RECOGNITION OF THE SOUTH

"You have forgot the laws and the traditions of your Fathers." *Demosthenes to the Athenians.*

"A neutral nation desirous safely to enjoy the conveniences of that state, is in all things to shew an exact impartiality between the parties at war." *Vattel's Law of Nations, b. iii., c. vii., p. 307.*

"The hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. Roebuck) had spoken of the invasion of the North, and said that Washington was now in danger, and that the South had nearly achelved their object. Why, then, in the name of common sense, not leave them alone to achieve it." *Speech of Lord R. Montagu, June 30th, 1863.*

About fourteen years ago, the Hungarian people succeeded after a numerous array of victories, in driving a powerful foreign ruler out of their country, and establishing themselves an independent nation. The struggle so far as Austria and Hungary were concerned, was not only "virtually" over, as the admirers of this new recognition doctrine would say, but it was positively and unquestionably brought to a close. Not only had the Hungarians completely scoured their country of the presence of all Austrians, but they had even followed them to their capital. The great and the grand proof of the utter inability of Austria to regain possession of that country, was the fact of her being compelled to have recourse to a most abominable Russian intervention. As soon as Hungary had fairly cleared herself of the presence of the Austrians and swept them out of her country, she made an appeal to England to be recognised as a nation. Every child knows the answer to that appeal. "We can receive no communication from any part of the *Austrian Empire*, only through the *Austrian Ambassador* in London." Where, then were your Manchester offices for "recognition"! Where, then were your clubs in Preston, your monster public meetings, your great placards, your motions in Parliament for Recognition! Then you knew nothing of such things, because there was *no Cotton* in the question!! If Cotton had stood behind the recognition of the Hungarian nationality, you would have moved Heaven and Earth to have brought it about. Nothing would have been left undone. But because it was a simple and a plain matter of justice, and because such a thing would have been disinterested and unselfish, there were no eyes to see it, and no hearts pure enough to make an effort to bring it about. Surely the English are a great and a magnanimous people. Is it not wonderful that the appeal of the Hungarians does not ring in their ears, and compel them from very shame to cease their agitation about recognition.

At the head of one of their placards vessels are pictured bringing Cotton, and the motto is printed "Cotton, the only substantial aid for Lancashire." The picture is truly indicative of the real motive of the whole recognition movement. Cotton is the banner, Cotton is the deity. Before Cotton, Her Majesty's proclamation of neutrality, the Laws, the setting of a dangerous precedent, and everything, must bend. The professed Atheist is scouted as a being dangerous to society, even although he may have given some proofs of self-sacrifice for principle's sake; but those men are far more dangerous to the country, who, professing that Christianity which enjoins the sacrifice of all earthly things, even life itself for what is right, yet shall try to lead the country away from a just and lawful neutrality, by setting up Cotton before everything, truly publishing the mammon-worshipping spirit that is animating them.

If thousands upon thousands of the people of England have been induced to leave the green hills and flowery vales where they were born, to huddle and pack themselves together, making densely populated towns and cities, breathing an air that is poisonous, and great numbers of them living that *fast* life, which so soon comes to a close; surely if so much of innocence, simplicity, health, and life has been sacrificed in this way, enough has been lost without adding to the list, the crime of an unjust intervention, even although that intervention be to get Cotton. From the first commencement of Cotton manufacture, we have been foolishly content to depend, in a very great measure, on one place for supply. If we are to have public meetings, and to put up placards, and form clubs, and have lectures, and have petitions to Parliament, let them be to get Cotton from other places. Is it not foolish to be dependent entirely upon one place for an article, upon which so many thousands depend for their daily bread? The aim of this recognition movement, is to still concentrate public attention, on one place for a supply. If all the time, money, agitation, and attention, which has already been laid out in producing a popular cry for recognition, had been spent in trying to get Cotton somewhere else, or to take steps to have it grown, something would have been done worth the trouble.

Mr. Bright warned the House of Commons on the 30th, how much worse a corn famine would be than a cotton famine. Let these recognitionists take care that one is not superadded to the other. If a collective European Intervention to the United States, should arrest the export of grain to this country, the prophecy of the Russian Historian, HAXTHAUSEN will be fulfilled, namely, "In a few years Europe will be dependent for its food, upon the black soil of Russia, and will then have to pay for it at famine prices.

Mr. Roebuck's motion for the recognition of the Southern Confederacy is a striking example of the power acquired by using, as a weapon of attack, words that have no defined meaning. In laws, whether municipal or international, there can be no abstract terms. The statement of a fact carries with it a corresponding obligation which cannot be evaded. When Great Britain recognised the independence of the United States, when Spain recognised the independence of her Colonies, Great Britain and Spain by that act made peace. The other nations, who, without waiting for the assent of Great Britain, acknowledged the independence of the British North American Colonies, at once prepared to become their allies in the war. If they had not done so, it would have been only because Great Britain was not strong enough to resist them. In any other war than one of independence no nation professing neutrality officially, expresses an opinion on the points in dispute: such an act would at once be reckoned as a breach of neutrality. In the case now being considered, the point of dispute is exactly this; whether the Southern Confederacy is independent or not. To recognise their independency is therefore to take their side. To pretend that this is consistent with neutrality, is to set up the modern code that contradictions are reconcileable, and that a neutral is one who is allowed to take a side, without incurring the risk of a belligerent. Mr. Roebuck's motion therefore, if put in a straightforward form of words could mean nothing less than a war with the United States, for the sake of the South.

It is laid down by Vattel that when two parties of a State are severed by rebellion it is lawful for a third party to side with the one he deems in the right. The American war of independence came under this description, but it would not have come under this description if the Americans had acted as Mr. Roebuck described them to have done. They did not as he pretended, declare that in consequence of their numbers and strength they were justified in setting up for themselves, they were in arms because the rights which they had enjoyed were invaded by the Parliament of Great Britain, and because an attempt was made to reduce them to a subjection which they had never known and to which they refused to submit. The quarrel was not complicated by territorial considerations. The remaining British territory commanded by the St. Laurence! the mouth of the Mississalppi belonged to neither party. The Hudson was in the absolute possession of the United States. The Allies who took part in the war were therefore able to do so without injury to any but their enemy. When peace was made it was not by a general treaty, the United States were not restrained by any European guarantee, but each belligerent made a seperate Treaty with Great Britain.

The existing circumstances bear no analogy whatever to those of 1775. The Southern States instead of being taxed without their own consent, have merely been beaten in an election in which they had more than the numerical share of votes, instead of having rebelled against the *acts* of the new President, they took care to rebel while yet his predecessor, who was their accomplice, remained in office, instead of exhausting every legal means of obtaining redress for alleged grievances, they neglected to make use of the privileges which the constitution gave them to call a convention by which secession might have been legalised.

Besides these irregularities there is a further difficulty in the way of any foreign state that should desire to take part with the Southern Confederacy.

They demand the control of the Mississippi, the mouth of which was purchased from France, by, and for the Union, and the free Navigation of which is so essential to the Western States, which do not hold Slavery, that it is now ceasing to be a secret that the South looks to the possession of the Mississippi, as a means of securing not its independence but of reconstructing the Union on a Southern basis, so as to give them back the supremesy which they have lost by the election of Mr. Lincoln, for England to recognise the Southern Confederacy is for her plunge into the vortex and to mix herself up with the most important of all the internal affairs of the United States.

But what is openly contemplated is still more than that which has just been described. It is that England and France shall intervene between the two parties on the ground of "humanity" trampling on the rights of both, and dictating terms of reconciliation. England is the Northern neighbour of the United States. France is now by her invasion of Mexico, their neighbour on the South. A forced mediation by England and France would only be a war in disguise. The United States are to be the "Sick Man" of the new world. When we recollect the loss of blood and treasure and character which has followed the English alliance with France in China and Turkey, we cannot help shuddering at the prospect before us if Mr. Roebuck's suggestion should ever be adopted.

Mr. Gladstone with the minute discrimination peculiar to himself, while he declared that in practice recognition of the independence of the Southern States could not be seperated from war in their behalf, admitted that a distinction might be made in theory. But it is difficult to understand in theory, how a great nation like England can separate the formal recognition of the independence of another state from acts in its support. Mr. Gladstone must have been thinking of Circassia. The British government have declared to that of Russia, that in theory they hold Circassia to be independent, yet in practice they intimate to British merchants that if they trade with this independent country whose ports are not blockaded, their ships will be seized by Russian Cruisers.

Would it not be worth while to enquire how it is that the British Government, who are afraid of maintaining their rights against Russia, who has not ships enough to blockade 150 miles of Circassia, should have no little fear of evaporating the United States, who are actually blockading some 3000 miles of coast. England and France by the Crimean War, gave to Russia the abolition of the Right of Search, and the possession as against Turkey, of the Black Sea. By their Chinese War they gave her the territory of the Amoor, that is of the Asiatic coast opposite the United States. By their War with Japan, they will give her a portion of that country. If they interfere in the United States, it must be for some interest not their own.

Issued by order of the Preston Foreign Affairs Association,

T. KERSHAW, Chairman.
W. SINGLETON, Secretary.

A Petition against Recognition, and for a continuance of Neutrality, is in course of Signature.

CHARLES AMBLER, PRINTER, 34, CANNON STREET, PRESTON

Francis Marx, and Charles Dobson Collet,[1] famous as the devoted Secretary for "The Association for the Repeal of the Tax on Newspapers and the Excise on Paper."

By their help and that of sympathisers in the various towns, 145 Committees were formed; some in large towns, some in the villages, where they were even more successful than in the towns.

"If life remains in England," said a working man, who knew the various Committees well, "it is in the villages. If hope can be entertained of her recovery, that hope is based upon the simpler and less sophisticated minds of our rural populations."

For their mutual encouragement the village Committees chose out a centre where once a month all the Committees met.

In the interval they visited one another, lent one another books, and kept one another up to the mark in cases of slackness. Besides these smaller groups there were "Districts" consisting of many Committees, which had their centre in some town like Leeds or Manchester. The District Meetings took place once in three or six months, and were generally addressed by Urquhart or Rolland or one of the other founders of the Society. "Schools of Public Law" Urquhart called them. They were, as we have seen, also

---

on the lines of land-tenure and local self-government. It still exists and flourishes as a little colony of free-holders who manage their own affairs in a Land-holders' Court.

A description of it will be found in the Appendix.

[1] "Charles Dobson Collet, who had achieved distinction as the Secretary of the twelve years' agitation for the Repeal of the Taxes on Knowledge, was a man of wide knowledge, versed alike in the literature of Law and Diplomacy. He was the greatest worker of his day for untaxed knowledge and untaxed travelling. His reasons for the Repeal of the Passenger Duty were delivered by him to the Society of Arts, in February, 1877. Viscount Gorst was in the chair. Mr. Collet and the present writer formed (October, 1877) a Committee of forty persons known as promoters of working-class progress; among them Joseph Cowen, M.P., Th. Burt, M.P., Henry Broadhurst M.P., Alderman Crawshaw (of Manchester), and others. . . .

"Mr. Collet, the Founder of the Committee for the Abolition of the Passenger Tax, in the interests of Commerce, and of the working classes, vigilant to the last, died in his 84th year."

History of the Travelling Tax, by G. J. Holyoake, 1901.

schools of character and of manners. Until 1864 Urquhart considered himself responsible for the training of the men, and they were encouraged to send to him for criticism reports of their conversations with their fellows or their superiors, and the private letters by which, for the most part, their propaganda was carried on.

If a man showed himself particularly able, he was generally invited to spend a little time under his chief's eye at Rickmansworth or later at Worthing. He was there supposed to give himself wholly to "self-improvement." The process was a severe one. The smallest fault in manner, any familiarity, stupidity, or thoughtlessness met with its meed, more than its meed it seems sometimes, of blame.[1] No excuses were admitted. If a man was right he must prove himself right, if wrong he must take the blame, but an excuse was anathema. It was the result of the deadly sin of wanting to seem right rather than to be right.

[1] Urquhart was as severe upon himself as he was upon others for any failure, however unintentional, in consideration or courtesy.

His self-discipline, however, was not without its inconvenient side. There is a story still current in the family of one of his oldest friends, David Ross of Bladensburg, which bears this out. On one occasion, when Urquhart and his wife were staying in the house, he wandered too long in the woods and returned home when everyone had finished dinner. The family had waited for some time, and when, at Mrs. Urquhart's request, dinner was served without him, his hostess took every care that he should not suffer for his lateness. This, however, did not meet Urquhart's view. He was late. It was a breach of good manners. He deserved no dinner. He would therefore have none.

His hostess' distress, however, at the idea of her guest going hungry to bed caused him to modify his determination. He would have some bread and cheese. The bread and cheese was therefore brought, when it occurred to him to toast the cheese; but he must toast it himself. It was summer and there was no fire. The fire had to be lit.

Behold him then at last established in front of the newly lit fire with his cheese at the end of a fork. But alas! in the midst of the operation an absorbing topic of conversation was started.

Urquhart turned to join in, cheese and all else forgotten, both by Urquhart and his hearers.

Softer and softer grew the cheese, longer and longer grew the long viscous yellow trail—till at last it disappeared into the fire, leaving Urquhart's toasting-fork bare.

This time he was adamant. Discourtesy crowned by inattention to the matter in hand could not be overlooked.

Urquhart went without even a bread and cheese dinner; and all his hostess' trouble was thrown away, to say nothing of the extra work entailed on servants.

To a man who had used a "vulgar expression" and tried to excuse himself on the ground that he was "but a working man, and therefore could not be expected to behave like a gentleman," Urquhart wrote:

"For me no difference exists in men because of their circumstances. . . . I will no more hold intercourse with a King than a shoemaker if not honest and if not polite. A vulgar term, an excuse in lieu of a desire to be right, I hold in equal abhorrence with a fraud or with perjury. The man who excuses himself maintains the maxim that it is not in him to be right. If you excuse yourself because of your station in life for being coarse and vulgar, you will also excuse yourself because of the age in which you live, for every ignorance, for every debasement, for every crime; you justify the very things your reprobation of which is the sole and only ground of intercourse between us, which intercourse now ceases unless these words awaken in you shame and repentance—shame for having written an idle word, and repentance for attempting to justify an error."

To another, who in apologising for an error had said, "I am sorry that I have hurt your feelings," and had mentioned in extenuation that he was liable to error in dealing with gentlemen, because he had "received no education," Urquhart wrote:

"You observe that many of the Committee men are in the same position as yourself; with the best intentions, possessing knowledge sufficient to rouse the most apathetic, yet having received no education, finding their efforts futile or noxious. Education is merely a bringing up. All the bringing up that a just man wants is to be taught to speak the truth, to know the right, to cling to it, and to abjure in himself, and prevent in others, the wrong. Such was the bringing up of the ignorant men who formed the noblest service that the learned have now to possess, namely, the Laws of England. Such was the bringing up or the second bringing up of the ploughmen and the fishermen who were the prophets of Israel and the Apostles of Christianity.

"When God's will is enacted upon earth at any time it is out of weakness that comes strength, it is from the lips of babes and sucklings that comes forth wisdom. In the case before us it was not knowledge that was wanting, it was not 'facts' that were deficient. Your letter which so

grieved me did so grieve me precisely because of the just appreciation of the facts, connected with a cavilling spirit. When I take up *The Times*, or any other newspaper, or read debates in the House I am not grieved; I have gone through them once for all. I know what the nation is, in so far that they do not know what to do or what to say. But, treating them as such, one may go on, if not hoping, toiling in this expectation that when the illusions are dispelled they may demean themselves as men. Your letter goes to the farthest point, being a specimen of the condition of Englishmen after their delusions *have* been dispelled, showing that the characters and energies of men have disappeared with them. I can continue my batt'e without compromise so long as the enemy I have to deal with is error, I cannot do so when it is once established that after error has been dispelled honour does not revive."

This method of Urquhart's in aiming at the highest, in being content with nothing less, had a two-fold effect. Some men were frightened away by it. When, however, men were really capable of appreciating the self-sacrifice, the labour, and the moral height of their master, they reached themselves great heights in thus following him. Some of them showed the greatness of their own characters in their ability to appreciate him, the scope of his work, what he would do for them, and what they must do for themselves.

One of them writes:

"Whatever his enemies say to the contrary, I unhesitatingly affirm that (Mr. Urquhart) is one of the most profound thinkers of modern times. Quick at perception, skilful in the arrangement of his thoughts, coherent, concentrative and logical in his expressions, fervent and energetic in their delivery, such a man is in every respect fitted for the high vocation of preceptor to a self-willed, ignorant, and benighted race. You say very properly, in answer to the idle words of those who are afraid to investigate, that Mr. Urquhart has no ambition to become a leader. Can (men) not understand that a man may be an instructor, without being a leader, and can they not see that a truthful teacher cannot inspire to leadership as the term is accepted, because his office is to raise others above the servile necessity of it, by developing qualities which make people wise and virtuous? Men may despise Mr. Urquhart for ex-

posing the wrong and denouncing the evil-doer, but they may at least calm their fears as regards his leadership of public opinion. That can never be, because it professes nothing that is solid, stable, or enduring. It is but a fleeting shadow, a dancing meteor, an exhalation or a passing breeze. In lieu of that which is futile and unsubstantial he would recommend us to study, so that, when appealed to, the introductory expression of each would be 'I know,' instead of 'I think.' This would be substituting knowledge for ignorance, fact for opinions. The end of such wisdom would direct us to Public Law, Public Rights, and create in us fortitude to enforce them. Therefore no man who has a knowledge of Law and its uses, and attends to its application, will whine for a leader, or excuse himself from doing what is right because he can't obtain one."

This letter well expresses the relation of Urquhart to the Committees. He founded them, he infused his spirit into them, he was ready to bestow love, labour, thought, care on them, he was their master; but he was in no sense the leader of a party. In 1864 his health obliged him to leave England; he never returned to it except for short visits, and the men were then entirely thrown on their own resources, with only their master's written words to encourage or rebuke them. But for more than fifteen years they continued their work, and their steady adherence to the principles in which they had been trained, their loyalty to a cause which they must have seen was making no headway, are proofs enough that the lofty ideals which had been set before them they had taken for their own standard of life, and are a sufficient answer to those who would accuse the Foreign Affairs Committees of having blindly followed Urquhart's lead.

CHAPTER VII

THE AIMS AND WORK OF THE COMMITTEES

"So natural is the union of Religion with Justice that we may boldly deem there is neither where both are not."—HOOKER.

"Our Fathers took care that what their Rulers did was lawful; we take for Law that which our Rulers do."—"*Free Press*" *Motto.*

THE great aims which David Urquhart set before the Committees were the restoration of the English Constitution and the re-establishment of Public Law among nations. All the evils under which the working man suffered, and which he thought would be remedied by the Franchise, Reform Bill, and Corn Laws Repeal, Urquhart said could only be remedied by the Restoration of Law.

"The Committees," he said, "are schools of Public Law. If properly conducted and sufficiently attended, those who compose them, though few in number, will perform the office that ought to be performed by the whole State. . . . The first business of the Committees is work; the second denunciation; the third prophecy. When they have possessed themselves of a knowledge of the Law and, so qualified, have possessed themselves of a knowledge of the facts, they are in a position to denounce, not indeed the Government, but their fellow-citizens. They are equally in a position to foretell, for it is only to the ignorant that there remains any mystery in the course of present events."

It was part of his creed that every intelligent member of the State ought to be conversant with its politics, its commerce, its finance. That the modern citizen was not so conversant, in so far as it was not attributable to his indolence, was due to the cloud of mystification in which those things were hidden from the public gaze.

This programme the Committees faithfully endeavoured to carry out. No public transaction took place during the

period of their activity, from the war in Afghanistan to the Congress of Brussels, in which the men of the Committees did not claim to exercise their right of Englishmen to make their voices heard in approval, criticism, or, more often, denunciation.

No peace was concluded, no Conference was held, no active interference in other countries took place which they did not judge with the knowledge and acumen of statesmen. Against the Declaration of Paris, with its surrender of England's Maritime Rights, they petitioned, not only the Queen, but both Houses of Parliament, and when it was a *fait accompli* they worked for twenty years to prevent its ratification, if not to bring about its abrogation. They found themselves in opposition to the great mass of their fellow-countrymen over the Indian Mutiny and on the question of Italian Unity. They sent a petition to the Pope for the Restoration of the Canon Law, and a deputation to the French Assembly, after the Franco-German War, begging the French nation to set up a Tribunal for judging causes of peace and war. It is true that in all these cases a lead was given to them by their master, but the letters they wrote and the petitions which they drew up contain their own ideas, and were often very obviously couched in their own words, while the deputations which were sent consisted of working men from among themselves, who set forth their own ideas in their own language. Not only were they exceedingly tiresome to successive Governments over current events, but they had an awkward habit of recurring to past acts of wrong and injustice, and demanding satisfaction and reparation. The crime of the Afghan War, for instance, took place in 1849. The falsified despatches were safely deposited in the Archives, and the Foreign Minister, who had made an unwarrantable attack on a friendly country, who had betrayed to death fifteen thousand of his fellow-countrymen, and, for his own ends, had tarnished a brave man's reputation and allowed him to rest in his grave under a cloud of dishonour, was still enjoying offices and honours.

But the Foreign Affairs Committees, in studying the

history of their own times, had fallen upon the story of the Afghan War. They had read in the Report of the East India Company Dr. Burnes' passionate outcry: "They garbled my brother's despatches"; as well as the tragic story told in Kaye's History, and they had decided that the tragedy of Afghanistan was a public crime.

In 1855 the Birmingham Foreign Affairs Committee published a Report in which they set forth their conclusions as follows:

"First, that the invasion of Afghanistan was not the act of the Directors of the East India Company, nor of the Governor-General of India, but of the Home Government.

"Secondly, that the pretext by which it was seen fit to justify the invasion—*i.e.*, that Dost Mohammed Khan, the ruler of Cabul, was a friend of Russia and an enemy of England, was utterly false, the contrary of that statement being true.

"Thirdly, that the pretext was sustained by extracts from the despatches of Sir Alexander Burnes, the English envoy at Caboul, which were laid before Parliament, being so artfully altered, falsified and garbled, that they bore a meaning precisely the reverse of that of the original despatches of Sir A. Burnes."

This was by no means the first time that this charge of falsification had been brought against the Government. In 1842 Mr. Henry Baillie had moved in the House of Commons for the production of the papers. Though seconded by Disraeli, the motion only received nine supporters. In 1843 Mr. Thomas Roebuck had made a motion to the same effect, which was defeated by 189 votes to 75.

In 1847 Anstey,[1] in his speech against Lord Palmerston, said:

[1] Thomas Chisholm Anstey was a barrister of the Inner Temple. Called to the Bar in 1839, he was, however, as much interested in religion as in law. He was deeply influenced by the Oxford Movement, but passed through it to become a Catholic. Some of his most interesting lectures on the English Constitution were delivered to the students of Prior Park, near Bath.

After his speech against Palmerston in the House, Palmerston invited him to dinner, and soon after appointed him Attorney-General of Hong-Kong. The action could hardly have been due to benevolence. The writer of the article on Anstey in the *Dictionary of National Biography* says:

"I say that forgeries, for it amounts to that, were committed for the purpose of misleading Parliament as to the intentions and disposition of the people of Afghanistan. This is particularly true with reference to the despatches of the late Sir Alexander Burnes, and I am in a position to prove it by reference to the original drafts of his despatches."

Palmerston had replied that, while it was true that passages had been omitted, they were only such as were irrelevant to the question at issue.

In 1857 the Foreign Affairs Committee of Newcastle appointed a sub-committee to inquire into the Afghan War, which issued the following Report:

"1. That certain despatches written by Sir Alexander Burnes, British Envoy at Caboul, in the years 1837 and 1838 to Sir William M'Naghten, Secretary to Lord Auckland, Governor-General of India, were not laid before Parliament in their complete form, but were mutilated and garbled in such a manner as to entirely alter their character and meaning.

"2. That Lord Palmerston in a speech in the House of Commons, on March 1st, 1848, acknowledged his responsibility, and that of his colleagues, for the suppression of passages of the despatches of Sir Alexander Burnes, in the Afghan Papers, Nos. 5 and 6, presented to Parliament in 1839; and has also admitted that these suppressions were not accidental, but designedly *made by them*, for the sake of brevity, and to avoid confusing the minds of members of the House of Commons.

"3. That the validity of this plea is a simple matter of evidence, to be settled only by comparison of the despatches

---

"Although his political conduct hardly seemed to give him any claim to Government Office, in 1854 Anstey was nominated Attorney-General to Hong-Kong."

He was suspended, however, in 1858, having come into collision with Sir John Bowring, the Governor, on the subject of the corrupt police practices by which the latter worked.

He ultimately attained to eminence at the Indian Bar. He occupied the Bench at Bombay in 1865.

Anstey and Urquhart were intimate friends during Urquhart's parliamentary career; and Anstey all through his life preserved a deep and sincere veneration for Urquhart. But after his defection Urquhart cut him off and would have no more intercourse with him. He, like Lothair Bucher, had, he said, been bought with a price.

of Sir Alexander Burnes, as published in the Blue Books, with his original and unmutilated despatches.

"4. That this duty has never been discharged by the House of Commons, although copies of the original and unmutilated despatches of Sir Alexander Burnes have been widely circulated by his friends and relations in defence of his character, and in vindication of his memory.

"5. That they (the Committee) have carefully compared the original despatches of Sir A. Burnes (copies of which they have obtained from his brother-in-law) with the Afghan Blue Books, Nos. 5 and 6, and they find that these alterations are so important that they cannot possibly be accounted for in the manner asserted by Lord Palmerston, but that they show the existence of a design to deceive the British Parliament and the Nation, by making it appear that the views of Sir A. Burnes were in favour of the acts of the ministers, in refusing to support, and in deposing Dost Mohammed, when in reality the original despatches prove he was strongly opposed to such an undertaking.

"G. CRAWSHAY, *Chairman.*
"G. STOBART, *Secretary.*

"NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE,
"*April* 6, 1857."

Attached to the Report are three appendixes, consisting of:

Appendix A.—The most prominent perversions contained in the Blue Books.

Appendix B.—Sir Alexander Burnes' original despatches with the omissions of the Blue Books marked.

Appendix C.—The Petition of the father of Sir Alexander Burnes for justice to his dead son, together with extracts from that son's private letters to his family.

The Report must have been a bitter pill for the Government as well as a blow for those who thought that at least in Blue Books the truth was to be found.

It was in direct consequence of the Report to the Newcastle Committee and the petitions of the other Committees that Mr. Hadford, the Member for Sheffield, brought forward a Motion in the House for the production of the original papers.

The Motion was agreed to, and the papers were produced.

Thanks to the good offices of Mr. Kaye, the historian of the Afghan War, then the Keeper of Political and Secret Service Papers, they were published with the original omissions in parallel columns marked in red ink so that the falsifications could be clearly seen.

The next step would have naturally been the punishment of those surviving members of the Government who were responsible for the disaster and fraud. "I have done my part," said Hadford to the Newcastle Committee, "it is for you to do yours." This the Committee willingly endeavoured to do. They in company with the other Committees petitioned Parliament:—

"That your Honourable House may take into their consideration the volume of documents entitled 'Copies of the Correspondence of Sir Alexander Burnes with the Governor of India during his Mission to Caboul in the years 1837 and 1838,' or such part thereof as has not been already published, and to make known by your decision thereon whether it was fit and proper to mutilate the terms and alter the sense of the despatches of Her Majesty's Service."

So heavily did the fear of Palmerston lie upon the House that it was with great difficulty that the Committees found a Member who would bring forward a Motion for an inquiry. At last, however, they succeeded, and in 1861 the Member for Greenock, Mr. Dunlop, moved that "a select Committee be appointed to consider the correspondence relating to Afghanistan as presented to the House in 1839 and the same correspondence as presented in 1858." The Motion was defeated by a large majority in spite of John Bright's[1] vigorous and impassioned speech in support of it.

[1] Lord Palmerston opposed the Motion on the grounds that the matter was past history, a matter indeed almost for antiquarian research and, it would have seemed by his remarks, of really very little importance. The greater part of his speech was taken up in belittling the character and ability of Sir Alexander Burnes. John Bright on this occasion was on the side of the Committees. "I do not suppose," he said, "that it is intended to arraign anybody for a policy which sacrificed at least 20,000 human beings, nor is it intended to inquire how the loss of more than £15,000,000 sterling by that policy has affected for all future time the finances and position of the Indian Government, but it is worth knowing whether there was

The Chinese War afforded the next field of the Committees' campaign for the re-establishment of Law and Justice.

The attack was opened in a way characteristic of the thoroughness of Urquhart's methods of training the Committees in regard to public questions. The *Free Press*, which, as the Committees increased, was his chief means of communicating with them, contained, in September, 1859, an account of the dealings of England with China, from the iniquitous introduction of the opium trade in 1833, to the forcing of the Peiho by Admiral Seymour. All the facts were collected from official documents, and left no doubt of the flagrant injustice towards China of the successive English Governments. The Committees at once took up the matter, and so impressive was their action upon the working classes that their membership quickly increased threefold.

As regards Urquhart himself, the action of the English Church in the Chinese War was the end of the hope he had once cherished that she might restore at least in England respect for the Law of Nations. The *volte-face* of the Bishop of Oxford in first denouncing the war as unjust, and then declaring that by it God had opened "a door for us in China," and the subserviency of the clergy in accepting, without remonstrance, the action of the Government, roused in him and his followers a passion of indignation.

The Stafford Committee wrote on its own initiative a long and cogent letter of remonstrance to the Bishop of Oxford, which his Lordship declined to read.

A working man, John Booth, wrote from Stockport to the Bishop of Lincoln in reference to his speech at the meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel:

---

a man in high position in the Government or in India who had so low an opinion of honour and right, that he should offer to this House mutilated, false, forged opinions of a public servant, who lost his life in the public service. I say an odious offence has been committed against this House, and we want to know who did it. The noble Lord does not think it is anything wrong. The letters he says are of 'trifling importance.' 'Sir Alexander's opinions are not worth much.' Be it so. But if this be a matter of so little importance will the noble Lord tell us who did it ?"

"At a public meeting of the members and friends of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel held at Willis' Rooms, your Lordship is reported to have said that God in His Providence had opened another country and given another road by which the Gospel could penetrate. I beg leave, my Lord, to submit that if God had opened China the means supplied were of God's appointment. I ask, my Lord, if this is not a blasphemous assertion, for we are told that God is a God of equity. Now I ask you, my Lord, were the means applied for the opening of China equitable? Are the sacrifice of human life and destruction of property (without just cause) the means instituted by the Almighty for the accomplishment of His purpose? If they are, the Atheist may well exclaim that the world would be better without such a God than to have one."

The Stafford Committees posted up huge placards setting forth to the working men the wrongs done to the Chinese.

"Without any declaration of war, your army bombards Canton, massacres its inhabitants; you call in the assistance of other Powers, terrify and alarm the Emperor, shake the sword even over Pekin, and after committing unheard-of cruelties, demand from that much-injured monarch £1,400,000, like the highwaymen: 'Stand and deliver!' We emphatically denounce these atrocities and extortions, and call upon you to do the same. Well may the Chinese call us barbarians, for what else are we? Will that ill-used people, think you, receive Christianity from our hands, stained with the blood of their fellow-men? Will our conduct be likely to increase our trade with them? They are not made of stone and have a memory."

On the eve of the departure to China of the punitive expedition of 1860, the following address from the various Committees to the soldiers and sailors was both posted up and circulated:

"Fellow-Countrymen,

"We, who have taken the trouble to inform ourselves as to what is, and what is not lawful, as to what constitutes War and what Piracy, address ourselves to you, who have not taken the trouble, and therefore do not know, to warn you of the guilt you are about to incur, and of the

dangers in which you are thereby going to involve us with the rest of your fellow-countrymen. War has not been declared against China. For in war a declaration has to be made to the enemy, and the proclamation thereof by the Queen, with the sanction of the Privy Council to her subjects. Such is the Law of the land and of all lands where there is virtue, honour, religion, or sense. Those who act otherwise are not even savages, for savages declare war before they kill men. It is this declaration and proclamation which saves the conscience of the soldier in slaughtering his fellow-men, and whoever, without this warrant, does use his weapon to destroy human life, is a base murderer, liable to be hung as a pirate by the people he attacks, and exposed to be condemned as a felon in England, according to the municipal law of the land.

"The order of a Secretary of State for levying war is no justification, and if the case be brought before a Court of Law the accused will not be screened by assigning such a document as the defence.

"The military oath has been from time immemorial to defend the State. If from the soldier were required an oath, which involved the commission of crime, it would be impious, and no citizen could take it. The duty of a soldier is super-added to that of a citizen, and does not destroy it: he undertakes the defence of his fellow-citizens, he does not become a salaried assassin. The soldier as a soldier has not to enquire into the justice of the war, but as a soldier he must know that it is lawful."

The document was signed by twenty delegates of Foreign Affairs Committees assembled, in their Conference at Manchester, January 8, 1860.

But perhaps the most important work the Committees took up was their action in the matter of the Declaration of Paris.

For nearly twenty years, from 1856 to 1875, they never ceased to demand the abrogation of a Treaty which contravened the ancient Maritime Law, which placed no hindrance in the way of enemy trade in time of war, and which took away from belligerents the Right of Search. They were thoroughly versed in all the bearings of the question, for, in this matter which he considered vital to the life of England, Urquhart had carefully and exhaustively instructed them.

In his eyes England lived or died by keeping or losing her Maritime Power. To the law-loving soul of one who had been a sailor in his adventurous youth the Law of the Seas was doubly dear. Quite early in his career he was brought into contact with that Law, both in theory and practice. He had in his boyhood come across a copy of Ward's *Maritime Law*,[1] and he had studied it with his accustomed eagerness. And what he knew he was called upon to use, when he acted as witness in the Admiral's Prize Court during the Greek War of Independence.

When, on the eve of the Crimean War, England and France agreed to waive their rights of seizing enemy goods if protected by a neutral flag, Urquhart set before his "schools of Public Law" the results of such an action. It meant, he said, that Russian trade would be unimpaired, that our preponderance of power at sea would avail nothing in the war, and that a determined effort would be made by Russia to make the arrangement permanent.

Events proved him to have been right. Trade between Russia and England never ceased during the war. The Admiralty advertised for and bought Russian tallow. The Government, driven into a corner by the indignation of many classes of the community, tried to excuse their action by pretending that they had acted in the interests of English trade. The Declaration of Paris which Russia manœuvred into the Peace Conference abundantly justified his prophecy that Russia, having obtained that for which she had been scheming ever since the time of the Armed Neutralities, would not again let it go.

Urquhart submitted to a long cross-examination by the working men of Birmingham, the results of which were afterwards embodied in a pamphlet. In it he sketched, in an answer to questions from the men, the history of Maritime Law from the laws laid down by the maritime

[1] Ward's *Treatise on Maritime Law* was published in 1801, at the request of Lord Grenville. It was reprinted in 1874 with a Preface by Lord Stanley of Alderley, who notes its complete and remarkable disappearance "within late years from those Public Libraries where it is known to have existed."

cities of the Mediterranean, and which were codified under the title of the "Consolato del Mare."[1]

He dealt with her enemies' various attempts, from the Armed Neutralities onward, to wrest from England her greatest defence. He showed that the plea of humanity which Russia had always made in her so-called attempts to gain for the rest of the world the "liberty of the seas" was but a false plea, since more could be accomplished at sea by the seizure of property than could be effected on land at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives.

The Foreign Affairs Committees were quick to grasp the ideas thus put before them and to recognise the danger that lurked in the "humanity and civilisation" of which the Declaration of Paris blatantly proclaimed itself the harbinger. To these men, versed in the Law of Nations, it seemed a display of ignorance on the one side and adroit machination on the other. They took up the position which for twenty years they steadily maintained, that it was quite impossible for the plenipotentiaries assembled in the Paris Conference to override the ancient Laws of Europe, that the Right of Search must be allowed to belligerents, that privateering was not necessarily an inhuman method of naval warfare, and that enemy trading could not, save at the risk of prolonged wars and increased armaments, be allowed to go on under neutral flags. This position they maintained by every means in their power—by addresses to the Queen, petitions to Parliament, public meetings, and lectures to working men.

On two points they found themselves on two separate occasions joining hands with the United States. The first of these occasions was in 1857, when America, being asked to sign the Declaration, objected to the article which con-

[1] He mistakenly attributes the *Consolato* to St. Louis. The earliest MSS. of it extant are in the Catalan language, and none are earlier than the fourteenth century. It is the *Book of the Consulate of the Sea, i.e.*, the Law of the "Consules Maris," the Commercial Judges of the Mediterranean cities. The Rhodean Sea Law is the oldest of all. It is referred to in the Canon Law:

"Rhodiæ leges navalium commerciorum sunt, ab insula Rhodo cognominatæ, in quâ antiquitus mercatorum usus fuit." (*Gratian, Decretals*, Pt. I., D. II., ch. viii.)

demned privateering, pointing out that she was dependent upon it for sea-power in time of war.[1]

Again, in 1862, during the American Civil War, in the affair of the *Trent*, they ranged themselves on the side of America, who had asserted the Right of Search by boarding an English vessel in search of two Commissioners of the Southern States who had found asylum there.

War between the two countries seemed imminent when America yielded and gave up the Commissioners. Urquhart had forewarned the Committees that this would probably be the upshot of the affair. "For," said he, "the rupture with America is not intended to lead to a long maritime struggle for the time being, but to a parliamentary sanction of the Declaration of Paris."

He was right. A Motion was brought forward in the House, "That the present state of International Law as affecting neutrals is so ill-defined and unsatisfactory as to call for the early attention of Her Majesty's Government."

This was what Urquhart feared; he warned the Committees against an attempt to introduce a new code of Maritime Law secretly inspired by those who were preparing for the day of great armaments. The Committees responded nobly: they petitioned, interviewed, held meetings, and wrote letters to the newspapers. Urquhart considered that they had won a victory when, though the Declaration of Paris was not repudiated, yet its supporters did not find themselves strong enough to bring about its actual affirmation.

This affair of the *Trent* drew forth from one of the members of the Manchester Committee, Mr. A. Smith, a journeyman shoemaker, eight letters on the Defences of England which appeared in the *Nottingham Weekly Times*. These letters attracted the attention of John Stuart Mill, and converted

[1] She declared, however, that if this article were extended to the protection of *all* private property at sea she would accept it. Cobden vigorously supported her on the ground that such a provision would practically abolish war, and make it but a "duel of Governments." This position of Cobden's led to a long correspondence between him and the Committees in which he was certainly worsted. It is to be found in the *Free Press Supplement*, December, 1859.

him to the writer's point of view on Maritime Law. So convinced was the veteran economist of the justice of the Committees' position on the subject that in 1867, when a motion was brought forward in the House to appoint a Commission on Maritime Law, he entirely took their side in strenuously resisting it, and moved, instead, for the complete abrogation of the Declaration of Paris.

The attention of the Committees was again called to the matter in 1870 by the Franco-Prussian War. Urquhart believed that the defeat of France had been in a very large measure due to the Declaration of Paris, which had rendered her navy useless.[1] He did not forget, moreover, that it was England who, at the beginning of the war, had bound France to that Declaration by Lord Granville's intimation that she must consider herself pledged to observe it. In September, 1870, the Foreign Affairs Committees of Cheshire sent an address to the Emperor of the French urging upon him its entire repudiation.

To appreciate the statesmanship and far-sightedness of this document we must remember that it was drawn up, not when Prussia had revealed herself in her true colours, but when she was the admired of Europe and considered to be the victim of France's ambition.

"We have seen with profound grief," began the address, "a foreign army advancing into France, and apparently about to inflict on Paris all the horrors of a siege. It increases our grief that this invasion has the appearance of having been wantonly provoked and ingeniously prepared by Prussia. We know that the nomination of a Prussian Prince to the throne of Spain was felt by every Frenchman not only as an insult, but as a preparation for an invasion of France by Prussia. After Prussia's seizure of Schleswig-Holstein by a fraud, after the breaking up by force of the German Confederation, of which she was a member . . . after her persistent refusal to execute the Treaty of Prague, it was evident that no reliance could be placed on Prussia's

[1] German trade was, he said, carried on by neutral merchantmen, while her navy was snugly tucked away in the harbour of Kiel. The French navy roamed the seas with nothing to do, and had to see food and contraband of war being carried to Germany, while she was powerless to prevent it.

sense of right or on her word, even when plighted to Germans. We know, too, that your Majesty had proposed to the King of Prussia a mutual disarmament, and that M. de Bismarck had refused his consent to any such arrangement. . . . From any further aggrandisement of Prussia consequences terrible to mankind are certain to follow, while it is possible to hope that such may not follow in case of the success of France.

"We therefore beg to point out to your Majesty the neglect of a very important means against the enemy of France in not sequestering her property placed within reach of seizure as being in passage over the sea. Thousands of Frenchmen are slaughtered by an enemy who is devastating France and is about to reduce the neighbourhood of the capital to a desert. Yet that enemy is allowed to carry on his trade in peace under a neutral flag. We are told that his plea for the abnegation of maritime power is to assimilate war on sea to war on land where private property is respected. Private property is not respected by the Prussians in France. The cause assigned for sparing Prussia at sea is the Declaration of Paris, which forbids the seizure of enemy goods in neutral vessels, a practice commonly followed by France as well as England until the Crimean War in 1854. But what is the Declaration of Paris? England is not bound by it, for even supposing that any State could alter the Law of Nations, the Conference of Paris was not competent to make laws for Englishmen. Not one of Her Majesty's servants has ever dared to ask for an Act of Parliament to sanction this change in the Laws of England."

Testimony, the more remarkable because it was unconscious, was born to the power of prevision with which Urquhart's training had endowed the working men of the Committees by a speech delivered four years later in the French Assembly by a Deputy, M. Jean Brunel, who pointed out how disastrous for them in the Franco-Prussian War had been the consequences of the Declaration of Paris, which prevented them from seizing at sea all the vessels which the great German ports of Hamburg, Bremen, Stettin and Dantzig sent out over the world, and so crippling the resources of Germany that she would have been forced to suspend her invasion of French territory.

In 1871 Mr. Cavendish Bentinck brought forward a Motion in the House that England should now withdraw from the Declaration of Paris. Mr. Gladstone, in his speech on the Motion, said that "the stipulations of the Declaration of Paris have a binding force at this moment."

His speech was taken up by the members of a society connected with the Birmingham Foreign Affairs Association, and the following correspondence took place:—[1]

"Mutual Improvement Society,
"54, Price Street,
"Birmingham,
"*May* 1, 1871.

"Sir,—I am directed by the above society to say that they have read with interest the debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Bentinck's Motion relative to the Declaration of Paris of 1856. In the debate you are reported to have said that the 'stipulations of the Declaration of Paris have a binding force at this moment, and the Government are not therefore at liberty to entertain any resolution for getting rid of them.' This society has lately had the Declaration of Paris under serious consideration, and its members are aware that the Declaration is in itself illegal, and by the words of Lord Clarendon himself is shown to be unauthorised, and has never yet been sanctioned by Crown, Parliament, or people of this country. Under these circumstances, I am directed to ask you to be kind enough to inform us whether you really used the words, and if so, from what source the stipulations not contained in the Treaty derive their binding force ?—I have, etc.,

"E. Cook, *Secretary.*

"Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P."

"10, Downing Street,
"Whitehall,
"*May* 8, 1871.

"Sir,—Mr. Gladstone desires me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter on the subject of the debate held in the House of Commons with reference to the 'Declaration of Paris,' and to inform you that treaty power belongs to the Crown, and the words of his speech on that occasion, agreeing with those of other authorities, went to show that the Declara-

[1] See *Diplomatic Review*, July, 1871.

tion partakes (in what degree he did not attempt precisely to define) of the character of a reciprocal engagement. Mr. Gladstone cannot speak precisely as to the phrases which he is reported to have used.—I have, etc.,

"W. B. GURDON.

"E. COOK, ESQ."

"MUTUAL IMPROVEMENT SOCIETY,
"BIRMINGHAM,
"*May* 15.

"SIR,—I am directed by the above society to acknowledge and thank you for your note of the 8th instant. The society have considered your letter, and instruct me to say that they are glad to find you laying down that "treaty power belongs to the Crown." With that they fully concur, and it was precisely because the Declaration of Paris was not contained in the treaty, and not made by authority of the Crown, and was, moreover, illegal in itself, and has never yet received the sanction of either Crown or Parliament, that they wished you to inform them from what source it derived the binding force you are reported to have attributed to it, but as you have shown no source from which it could have derived that binding force, we must presume there is no force in it, and as you cannot speak precisely as to the terms you used, while at the same time it is of consequence that a man in your position should not appear to give value to a declaration of that nature, I am instructed to respectfully ask you, for your own sake and the welfare of our common country, to take or make an early opportunity of declaring publicly that the treaty power belongs to the Crown only, and consequently the Declaration of Paris has no binding force on this country, and is null and void, and taking the necessary legal steps in connection therewith.—I have the honour to be, on behalf of the society,

"EDWIN COOK, *Secretary*.

"RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P."

"10, DOWNING STREET,
"WHITEHALL,
"*May* 17.

"SIR,—Mr. Gladstone desires me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, and to inform you that the Declaration of Paris was made by persons whom the Crown had authorised to that effect.—I am, Sir, etc.,

"W. B. GURDON."

"Birmingham,
"*May* 19.

"Sir,—I am directed by the 'Price Street Mutual Improvement Society' to thank you for your note of the 17th instant, and to say that the Declaration of Paris (not the treaty) professed to alter the Law of Nations and reverse the practice (which in former times accorded with the Law) of this country. We know that the Crown has power to conclude treaties *in accordance with law*, but 'the King can do no wrong,' and we therefore find Bracton writing thus: 'Rex in Regno duos superiores habet, Deum et Legem.'

"Who, then, has the power to alter the law of nations, which is defined to be 'The principles of the law of nature applied to the conduct and the affairs of nations and sovereigns'? And, according to Lord Hobart in his Reports, page 87: 'Jura naturæ sunt immutabilia—sunt leges legum.'

"But the question is not one of the power of the Crown, it is now reduced to one of the authority given to Lord Clarendon. That nobleman said, in speaking of this very Declaration: 'If we had confined ourselves within the strict limits of our attributions, we should have lost the opportunity when the representatives of the principal Powers of Europe were met together for discussion.'

We are astonished to hear from you that the Crown did authorise the Declaration of Paris, and, as we believe it would go far to settle at least one point of the controversy on the subject if that fact were generally known, may we beg of you to tell us where we can find the evidence of such authorisation.—I have the honour, etc.,

"Edwin Cook, *Secretary*.

"Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P."

"10, Downing Street,
"Whitehall,
"*May* 22.

"Sir,—Mr. Gladstone desires me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, inquiring where evidence may be found that the Declaration of Paris was made by persons whom the Crown had authorised to that effect.

I am directed to refer you to the full powers of the Envoys, and the records supplied by the protocols.—I am, Sir, etc.,

"W. B. Gurdon."

"Birmingham,
"*May* 30.

"Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of the 22nd instant. We have carefully looked through the Blue Book on the Conference of Paris, 1856, but have been unable to find the authority under which Lord Clarendon acted when he signed the Declaration on Maritime Law. I am, therefore, instructed to ask you to still further extend your kindness to us by stating to what particular protocol you referred.—I have the honour to be, etc.,

"E. Cook, *Secretary.*

"Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P."

"10, Downing Street,
"Whitehall,
"*June* 2.

"Sir,—Mr. Gladstone desires me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of May 30th, and to express his regret that he is not able to enter into further details respecting the matter which you have brought before him.—I am, Sir, etc.,

"W. B. Gurdon.

"E. Cook, Esq."

"Birmingham,
"*June* 3.

"Sir,—I am directed by the above society to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of the 22nd instant. This society, seeing that your name was used to give apparent sanction to the Declaration of Paris, asked to be informed of the source of the binding force you attributed to it. You replied, 'treaty power belongs to the Crown,' evidently meaning us to infer that the 'Declaration' had the force of a treaty, and the Crown was to be used as a scapegoat to bear the blame. The society answered that the 'Declaration' was not part of the Treaty, and had not been the act of or sanctioned by the Crown, and asked you to take steps to get it declared null. You replied that the 'Crown had authorised' the Declaration. The society then asked for evidence of the authority. In reply you referred us to the 'full powers' and the 'protocols.' The society answered that after careful examination of the protocols, they could not find the authority, and asked

you to specify them to which you referred. You then 'regret that you are unable to enter into further details.'

The society instruct me to say, that as you are *unable* to point out the 'authority' given to Lord Clarendon, they have again for themselves carefully examined the Protocols of the Conference of Paris. The Envoys there assembled had full powers to make peace with Russia, and that was all.

"Peace was signed on the 30th March, 1856.

"On the 8th of March, 1856, Count Walewski first introduced the subject of Maritime Law, and proposed the Declaration. Lord Clarendon said 'England was disposed to agree' on conditions (which have not been carried out), the Envoys of Russia, Austria, and Prussia expressly stating that they had no instructions on the subject. The Protocols do not, therefore, contain what your letter inferred we should find in them; and, as in ordinary life, when a man makes a statement which he is *unable* to substantiate, his regret should lead him to *own* he was wrong and *set himself right*, I am instructed to ask you to rectify your former statement, that 'the Crown had authorised' the Declaration of Paris, and to take steps to have it declared null.

"If your 'regret' should lead to this result it will end in the pleasure of knowing you have done right and will not be in vain.

"If it does not, this society will know how to estimate a man who is *unable* to show that he is right or to admit that he is wrong.—I have, Sir, etc.,

"E. Cook, *Secretary.*

"Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P."

"10, Downing Street,
"Whitehall,
"*June* 6, 1871.

"Sir,—Mr. Gladstone desires me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 3rd.—I am, Sir, etc.,

"W. B. Gurdon.

"E. Cook, Esq."

This was the end of the correspondence!

In 1874 England was invited to send a representative to the Congress of Brussels, which had been called by Russia for the avowed purpose of drawing up a Code of Inter-

national Law. Urquhart describes it, in the *Diplomatic Review*, as a further attempt to give over the world into the hands of Powers possessing huge armaments.

The Foreign Affairs Committees of Cheshire, Lancashire, Yorkshire and Northumberland addressed a circular letter to their fellow-workers setting forth the dangers that lurked in the Congress. They dealt with two of its articles in particular, one of which was directed against England's sea power, while the other gave to armies of occupation of an invaded country absolute and legal claim on the allegiance of the inhabitants of that country.

"That means," they pointed out, "that the command of the world will be transferred from the naval to the military powers; you will be unable to defend your colonies, which will fall into the hands of the enemy, who for a hundred years has been endeavouring to bring ruin upon you. Your enemy's commerce will ride the sea securely and safely while your enemy's armies are invading India. . . . It only requires to recollect the former times, and to use your own sense, which will tell you that our country can only be defended by naval power, and that it is not when the armies of the Continent, raised by constraint, count by millions, and are getting larger every day, that England can afford to abate one jot or tittle of those advantages she possesses by her geographical position."

The Foreign Affairs Committees of Hockley and Birmingham joined with the Birmingham Liberal Association and the Birmingham Conservative Working Men's Association in presenting a petition to Disraeli against the representation of England at the Congress, and a large public meeting was held at Macclesfield under the auspices of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the same purpose. Amongst those on the platform was the old Chartist Wesleyan Minister, Stephens of Stalybridge, who had for a long time now been working with the Foreign Affairs Committees. Twenty of the Committees addressed Disraeli on the same subject, and most of the journals of provincial towns where there were Committees published letters from some members of them.

David Rule, a member of the Newcastle Foreign Affairs

Committees, a plasterer by trade, who had already written a striking pamphlet on the Right of Search, wrote to the *Newcastle Chronicle* a letter in which, after specifying the reasons why, at that particular juncture, England's enemies should wish to manacle her without seeming to do so, ended by saying:

"The interests of France are identical with those of England in this matter, as there is good reason to believe that had France not agreed to observe the Declaration of Paris the late war between her and Germany would have been avoided, as was the contemplated war in 1867 by the dread of France exercising her Maritime Power on German commerce.[1] Prussia expects another war with France and wished to secure the certainty of success by striking off one of her arms."

The activities of the Committees were this year (1874) stimulated by the presence of David Urquhart in England. For twelve years the magnetism of his personality had been withdrawn from them, and all his health had allowed him to do had been done by correspondence.

At a large meeting of the Committees at Keighley, he spoke with all his old fire, reminding them how in earlier days he traversed England from end to end to find the materials out of which the Committees were formed:

"Here a weaver in a garret at Paisley, here a shoemaker in a Staffordshire workshop, there a factory worker, enfeebled by his long hours of toil—such were the men with whom almost alone in England I found I could work."

He went step by step through the history of Europe since that time to this last danger threatened by the Congress of Brussels, showing how year by year events had been working towards one end, the dominance of a single Power in Europe.

England sent a representative to the Congress of Brussels, but with instructions:[2]

[1] England had on that occasion reminded Germany that the Declaration of Paris was capable of abrogation.

[2] See *Diplomatic Review*, July, 1874.

"To take no share in the discussion on the rules of International Law whereby belligerents are guided, and to undertake no new obligations or engagements of any kind with regard to general principles. You will also abstain," said the instructions, "from taking part in any discussions upon any points which may be brought forward, which may appear to you to extend to general principles of International Law not already recognised and accepted."

It must not be thought that the Committees' activities were limited to the matters mentioned in this chapter. There was no affair of public interest in which they did not concern themselves. The Boundary Question, the Newfoundland Fisheries dispute, the Danish Succession, the Question of the Duchies, the American Civil War, the Italian Unification, the loss of the Temporal Power of the Pope, Irish Home Rule, and the never dying Eastern Question—about all these things they not only talked, but acted, and, having chosen the side which they considered that of Law and Justice, they maintained it by all the means at their disposal. The disasters and oppression of Poland and the fall of Circassia were to them personal disgrace, and matters for grief and tears. In the Indian Mutiny they insisted on the fact that the wrongs were not all on one side, and in the Persian War they issued a bold manifesto to the soldiers about to be engaged in it. They never hesitated to protest against any measure, or proposed measure, that seemed to them against the public Law. They must have been a thorn in the side of many successive Ministers of the Crown. Of their method of dealing with such, their correspondence with Mr. Gladstone on the Powers of the Plenipotentiaries in the Congress of Paris is a very good example. They never allowed themselves to be put off by words, but always insisted on a clear and definite statement of facts which was susceptible of proof. However respectfully they put a question, they clearly indicated that it was asked by those who had a right to ask it. And they administered reproof or expressed disapprobation in a manner which must have been excessively annoying to mid-Victorian statesmen, who had not yet

learnt that they were, after all, but the servants of the people.[1]

[1] The work of the Foreign Affairs Committees, it need hardly be said, did not pass unnoticed by the contemporary Press.

The highest tribute paid them was perhaps the bitter scorn and ridicule which were heaped upon them and their leader by the papers which were in the Government interest.

Still, many were the honest and worthy tributes borne to them by contemporary journals.

Such is the following, taken from the *Press* of October 16, 1858:

"The Foreign Affairs Committees in the North of England.

"There are few of our readers but must, at intervals, have observed in the newspapers correspondences between the bodies which have assumed to themselves the above designation, and the different members of the past and present Administration. But we rather think that, nevertheless, the majority of our readers have no distinct idea of the history of these Committees, or of their organisation, their composition, and their objects. Notwithstanding, they are by no means unworthy of attention, for the extent of their organisation forms a rather remarkable feature in our present social position. When we tell our readers that in some seventy of the principal manufacturing towns in this country these Committees meet weekly, to consider the state of our foreign relations—that many of them have obtained an extensive knowledge of all the proceedings of our Foreign-office for the last fifty years, and that they discuss the merits of those proceedings with a judgment and ability which would do credit to many a member of the Legislature—and further (what is far the most remarkable circumstance connected with them), that they are composed only of working men, obtaining their livelihood by the sweat of their brow, we think it cannot be denied that it is worth the while of the public to know something more about them than is generally known at present.

"These Committees, then, mainly owe their existence to the untiring energy and indomitable perseverance of one single individual, who, if he had been endowed with a sound judgment and a power of accurately discerning facts, would, with such instruments as these at his disposal, have long ago succeeded in making a deep impression on the public mind. Unfortunately, however, so much of eccentricity has pervaded his views, so hastily has he brought forward statements which would not bear scrutiny, that he has given to his opponents the advantage of being able to discredit those of his principles and his views which are, in fact, wise and profound, so that truth has come to be disregarded, because it has been unfortunately largely mingled with error. Still, whatever may be his faults, he has contrived to imbue his followers with as right and patriotic sentiments as ever animated the greatest of our English statesmen.

"Now, we believe that there are at present very few individuals who have taken the trouble really to master the true nature of our dealings, for the last twenty-eight years, with foreign nations, whether in Europe or in Asia, but have arrived at this conclusion—viz., that most of the wars in which, since 1830, England has been

involved, have been impolitic and unnecessary, and, what is far worse, not to be justified in their origin, when tested by the principles of international law. Where is the honest man who, having *carefully* looked into the alleged causes, will venture to defend the justice of the Afghan, the Burmese, and the Chinese wars? Where is the wise man who, after having weighed their consequences, will venture to affirm that they were beneficial and politic? Unhappily, the vast majority of the people of this country have not troubled themselves with these matters. They have borne in ignorant patience the increased taxation which they have caused, and they have been content to take for granted that England is as just as she is glorious, and as unselfish as she is great. They have assumed without inquiry that such a nation would never engage in any wars which dire necessity had not forced upon her. They have formed the most false but most magnificent notions of her disinterested conduct, and have been able to listen with the utmost complacency to the declamation of her statesmen against the grasping aggressions of Russia, without a suspicion crossing their minds that the indignant commentaries which were directed against the Czar were even more applicable to her own aggressions.

"Now, the up-hill and ungracious task which these Committees have set themselves has been to arouse their countrymen to a just sense of these our national delinquencies, to wake them from the day-dream of innocence in which they have too long indulged, and to get them to view the national policy of this country as it is too surely viewed by the more impartial optics of neighbouring nations. Their one single cry is: 'Let us procure the re-establishment of law throughout the world; let us only behold our country once more acting as the asserter, and not the violator, of international law, and we shall be content. We care comparatively little for Reform, for the Ballot, for Free Trade, or for any other of the popular cries which politicians have raised; but we do care for the honour and the good faith of our country, and we can live happy if we can but see it restored.'

"Such is the language that for some three or four years has been heard to issue from the lips of working men—men with rough hands, and with rude address—men who once clamoured for the Charter and the Ballot, but whose language now reaches the pitch of patriotic eloquence, and whose honesty of sentiment is worthy of the noblest legislator that ever addressed the Parliament of England.

"It may be true that these Committees appear sometimes to be acting in a sphere for which they are not fitted; but it is not to be wondered at that men in their position of life should sometimes blunder, and should venture on inquiries which perhaps they may be hardly justified in addressing to official persons. Unskilled in the business and duties of the Executive, they may sometimes ask questions which those of whom they ask them may fairly meet by curt, and merely formal, answers. But all this is the mere by-play of the part which they are acting. The task which they have set themselves is to create an interest, in the public mind of the great manufacturing towns, in foreign affairs. They believe, and surely their belief is a true one, that the internal prosperity of this great nation is deeply affected by the management, or the mismanagement, of our external relations; that every man throughout the country is affected more or less by the expenditure occasioned by expensive wars, carried

on at a distance, on unjustifiable pretences, and for the attainment of very doubtful advantages. They believe that each individual subject of the Queen ought to feel interested in England being *the* nation to stand forth as the doer of justice, and the upholder of international law; and they know too well, and they desire to impart the knowledge to others, that, under the guidance of Lord Palmerston, England lost her fair fame, and appeared before the world as a nation defiant of law, blustering to the weak, and truckling to the strong.

"Such is the character, such the objects of 'The Committees of Foreign Affairs.' Had they not been composed of working men, and had they not afforded evidence of what working men are capable of, we perhaps should not have thought it necessary to give our readers this insight into their organisation and objects."

CHAPTER VIII

WHY THE COMMITTEES SUCCEEDED AND WHY THEY FAILED

" I give you the end of a golden string,
Only wind it into a ball;
It will lead you in at Heaven's Gate,
Built in Jerusalem's Wall."

BLAKE: *Jerusalem.*

THE study of the Committees presents two main points of difficulty: why they lasted so long and why they ultimately failed.

Why was it possible for Societies which made an apparently impossible demand upon the character, disinterestedness, diligence, and self-denial of ordinary working men, which required that they should practise virtues that seem heroic, give themselves up to Herculean labours, expose themselves to ridicule from their fellows and persecution from their employers, for what they must have gradually come to realise to be a forlorn hope and to maintain themselves for more than twenty years at the same high level of work and character? It is almost impossible to imagine the working men of our own day acting thus as apostles and witnesses, not only without the support of their own class, but in many cases in spite of its strenuous opposition.

For these Societies were, as we have seen, by no means academic. These men were not theorists or members of study-circles, who sat and talked about Reconstruction. They were active apostles and missionaries. Their field of operations extended from the Queen and her Ministers to the man who worked next to them at the carpenter's bench, or in the shoemaker's shop, to their comrades in the factory or the workshop. They were prepared to lose their work, and, as their letters show, sometimes did so,

rather than cease to preach to their fellows what they deemed vital to the life and welfare of the nation.

But what seems strange is perhaps, after all, very natural. It was on these very things that the life of the Committees depended; for when all is said and done, life feeds on struggles, hardness, difficulties, opposition. The life which is reared on softness, which goes with its eyes fixed on more food, more leisure, more amusements, higher wages and less to do for them, is a "ghastly smooth life, dead at heart." It is no life for the spirit of man.

When we think of the working men of the Chartist times, with their scant food, their poor lodgings, their long hours of toil, and contrast them with the working men of our own day, who seem, though happily with notable exceptions, wholly absorbed in bettering the material conditions of their own class, it is impossible not to be alarmed at the apparent decline of character and ideals.

There is no doubt that a powerful element in the success of the Committees was Urquhart's own personality, intense conviction, and deep mystical insight.

Such men as he have often been found leading religious movements, but few, like him, leading a movement in which the world saw only a political one. David Urquhart has been called by one of his own children a "mystic in politics." He was truly so if to politics we give its proper meaning, the art of living in the State. Rightly to conduct oneself in the State was necessary to the character of a Christian. This the world had forgotten, and this Urquhart held it to be his mission to teach it.

He saw perfect Justice with the inward vision of the mystic. He saw it as beautiful in its severity as in its tenderness.

And he saw Injustice let loose on the world, soft where it should have been stern, or cruel where it should have been mild. He saw that Injustice, that apotheosis of material force, incarnate in the person of Russia. So Russia became his anti-Christ, his Dragon, and Urquhart girt his loins like Athanasius, or even more like Savonarola, to do battle with the Dragon. Like slayers of Dragons in all times he saw the Dragon's slime everywhere, he felt its hot breath polluting the air of Heaven, he marked its mangled and slain

victims, until his soul was full of rage and pity, and for him there were only two things in the world, God and the Dragon.

Perhaps it is the influence of St. George which makes Englishmen followers of Dragon-slayers.

Certainly men followed Urquhart, not the less willingly because he sought to slay the Dragon in themselves as well as in the world. He had all the faults of Dragon-slayers; he could see nothing but the Dragon; everywhere he found its traces. He had all the extravagances, the intolerance, the recklessness, that mark his kind.

Sometimes he attacked the Dragon where no Dragon was. But his followers were not daunted by such things. For he had the inward vision, he never failed of his convictions or singleness of purpose. All his life he never ceased to be, to a few chosen spirits, the "sent of God."

Moreover he appealed to the highest that was in a man. He had a way peculiar to those who have suffered in the flesh, as Urquhart had in his early years, of ignoring material things. Shortness of food, want of rest, excessive toil—all these things, what were they? A man could rise above them, so long as his heart was pure. Hunger and cold and pain, what were they? He could, and did, teach his own young children to bear them. Even want of education and grinding toil could not interfere with the real man, so long as he was just, pure and honourable.

The working men to whom this high and unique appeal was made, by this man whose words were all acts, answered it with an alacrity and a joy unimaginable by those who do not know the heights there are in unspoilt or regenerate human nature.

But perhaps the strongest appeal which Urquhart made to the working men of the Committees was that he took for granted that they were the very soul and mind of the body politic. What were the powers of the men who had a vote, compared with those of the men who, day by day, in season and out of season, were bringing the highest principles of Law and Justice to bear upon the actions of the State, who were constantly arraigning statesmen and their actions before the bar of the supreme Justice, and

who, having cast aside every desire of self-aggrandisement, self-interest, and even class-interest, were concerned only that their country should stand forth among the nations as the lover of Truth and the doer of Justice ?

These men had reached the Land of Liberty, the liberty of the spirit, and they had no desire to return to the bondage of the world.

It is, however, undeniable that the men to whom such an appeal could be successfully made were comparatively few.

It is the tragedy of every great idea that it must be content either to descend to the level of the many, or to make its appeal to a minority which can, in the eyes of the world, be ignored.

The Franciscan Order must have come to an end had the great idea of its founder been retained in all its height and grandeur.

Savonarola's company could not exist in the midst of a naughty world after its first enthusiasm was past. All the great ideas that have prevailed and endured have been content to put off their " extravagances," as the world persists in calling them, or have been obliged to be content to appeal to a few. The Church herself must let the greater number go a lower way, and bind only a few to the Counsels of Perfection.

Urquhart was bound to fail, because he would not, or could not, recognise this. The command, " Be ye perfect," was, he maintained, a command to all. But it is only the few who really hunger after perfection: it is only to the elect that it makes its irresistible appeal.

Therefore Urquhart failed utterly to impress his creed upon the thousands of working men whom he addressed at his crowded meetings in the early days of the Committees.

The few, it is true, accepted it then, and to the end of his life, but there was no prophet to take up the mantle which, dying, he cast off. Few of the Foreign Affairs Committees survived him more than a few years.

But there were secondary causes which, even during his lifetime, had contributed to the partial failure of the Committees.

At their highest point they never numbered more than

about one hundred and fifty, with a total of working-class membership of certainly not more than two or three thousand. Their moral effect was, however, far greater than their numbers warranted. They had a real influence on the public opinion, not alone of the working classes, but also of the towns and villages where they established themselves.

Yet they were failures. By the great mass of the working men they were considered impracticable and singular. The " Committee-men " were not interested in the ordinary working-class interests, in Trades Unions, votes, labour legislation. Like their master, they pushed these things aside as something of quite minor importance, and the ordinary working man regarded them as belonging to the Conservative party. The simple fact was that he could not believe in, or even realise, men without party spirit or class aims.

The Committees offered no material inducements; they demanded hard work, sacrifice of time and leisure, and even money.

Membership in them carried no benefits; instead it involved personal inconvenience for causes which, to the bulk of working men, grew year by year to be of less importance. Year by year it became more difficult to interest them in matters of international importance.

In part this was no doubt due to the gradual loss of character among the people, which Urquhart had predicted, and which old Frost the Chartist saw when he returned to England from his transportation to Australia.

" I have returned to England," he said, " to discover that that class of men who, twenty years ago, were the only ones capable of entertaining a vigorous thought, or of approving that thought by a daring act, have now become the partisans and abettors of the crimes of men in authority, even when these men do not require their aid, and perhaps have not even thought it worth while to purchase their assistance. No disaster befalling our arms or our power in India, nor the prospective loss of that magnificent Empire, nor the perfidies that have soiled the British name in those deeds of civil administration which have produced the danger, can strike with so heavy a blow at the heart of

a patriot, as this exhibition of cowardice and degradation in men of that humble class of society, from whose indignant virtue hope alone could spring, when those placed above them had neglected their public duties."[1]

A great change was gradually coming over England. The grinding oppression and the poverty which had weighed down the working classes were slowly but surely lessening. Each year their material lot grew lighter, and the tendency was to grasp all that was given, to stretch out their hands for more, and to forget all else.

The justice or injustice of foreign relations meant less and less to them as bread got cheaper, work more plentiful, and wages higher. The huge armaments which were piling up all over Europe did not trouble them. They did not realise that they were being taxed for their upkeep.

The Chartist newspapers of the days of the rising were full of the increase in taxation for the support of standing armies. But in 1870, when they had increased three and fourfold, the working men looked upon them with indifference. Europe drifted ever nearer to the edge of the abyss, but they saw it not; the claims, the desires, the wrongs of labour filled their whole horizon, and it is doubtful whether any leader, even one less exaggerated, more commonplace, more of their own world, could have induced them to see that their prosperity ultimately depended on questions of International Justice and Law.

Probably Urquhart would have gained more adherents had he given so-called Labour aims more place in his

[1] This letter was written to *Reynolds' Newspaper*, after a meeting held at the London Tavern to protest against the proposed abolition of the East India Company, at which the working men took the side of the Government, and howled down Frost. Frost goes on to say in the same letter:

"Simultaneously with the discovery I have above narrated, I have made another of an opposite character. I have discovered that during my absence and seclusion there have been found among the Chartists men willing and capable to apply their minds to those great and solemn matters which arise in an imperilled State, and I trust that by the publication of this letter you will afford me the opportunity of conveying to them my resolution to devote my best energies to rescuing this land out of the hands of those bad men who have brought her to the present condition of great peril."

Frost here refers to the F.A. Committees, with which henceforward he worked. He settled down in Bristol and became known as an "Urquhartite" and a Tory.

programme. Instead of which he almost passionately refused to consider them. " Class " politics he condemned as ruthlessly as party politics. Earlier in his life he had pointed out how domestic distress and International Justice were connected, but the working men wanted to be told, not alone how distress followed injustice, but how the opportunity, which they intensely and rightly desired, for a happy and satisfactory life would follow in the wake of International Justice. Urquhart had never really appreciated their craving for at least a moderate degree of comfort and leisure. He had never cared for those things himself, and he could not understand why they should mean so much to other people.

Moreover, from the time of the Indian Mutiny, when he took a line emphatically not that of his countrymen, Urquhart became more and more alienated from the people of England, and his followers had to bear his reproach. The word " Urquhartite " was a name of scorn, it stood for reaction, for singularity, for everything un-English; it was opposed to the magic Shibboleths " Progress, Civilisation, Reform," to everything for which Cobden and Bright and Gladstone stood.

So long had he talked of danger, while England seemed closely wrapped in peace and security, that to the popular mind he had become as one crying " Wolf, wolf !" when there was no wolf.

If politicians of wider outlook saw the black muzzle ready to devour them, they said nothing to dispel the pleasant dreams in which their countrymen lay wrapped.

Now the danger so long threatened is on us, the working men have awakened to some sense of the responsibility in regard to their country, and it seems to some of us high time for Urquhart to be vindicated.

It is impossible, however, to overlook the fact that in part the failure of the Committees was due to Urquhart himself. He was indeed more fitted to be the leader of a forlorn hope, to champion a failing cause at a great crisis, than to lead ordinary men in everyday life. His very belief in the power of men to be right made him intolerant of any wrong; and when wrong was done he included the

deed and the doer in the same condemnation, and refused to have anything to do with either. The Christian practice of separating the sin from the sinner did not exist for him. He was a prophet of the Old Testament in this as in all else: Achan and the accursed thing were involved in one common destruction. The weakness of human nature awoke in him not pity, but anger and contempt. The failure of man to do what he knew was right, ignorance and sloth were to him as the sins of injustice and untruth, and any attempt to excuse them increased their guilt tenfold.

This very refusal to allow a man to justify himself raised a barrier between Urquhart and the men who wished to follow him; many of them fell away from him, because they could not express themselves freely to him. The principle of "Either you were right and must show yourself to have been right, or you are wrong and must admit it," does not always hold good, and the working men, though they could not explain the reasons for this knowledge, knew that it did not. They were no match for him in the power of argument and in eloquence, and were silent, but they were unconvinced of the truth of his reasoning. They lacked the philosophy to see that both sides were right, that while for them and for most people there must be a middle course between the perfection they could appreciate, but to which they could not yet attain, and the evil which they hated but could not altogether avoid, such a *via media* did not exist for him.

The difference between Urquhart and the ordinary man was the difference which exists between a saint and an everyday Christian in respect of sin. The saint puts it away at once and for all with so strong a hand that it has no more hold over him. But with most of us it is not so. Our feeble push is so feeble that it comes back again and again, and we seem to steer a middle course between good and evil.

Urquhart once and for all fought back what he had discovered to be sin, and never afterwards yielded a step to its attacks. "It is my daily and hourly endeavour to be a Christian," he said—"that is, to have a right judgment in all things." He could not understand that an en-

deavour which never relaxed could fail. Failure meant lack of endeavour, and therefore every defeat was a matter, not for excuse or palliation, but for shame and repentance. This position not only had the effect of creating a barrier between himself and many of the working men, it gave to outsiders an entirely erroneous impression that Urquhart was "cock-sure." The absolute conviction which he had of the justice and truth of his course and his own imperative duty to maintain it against all the world, seemed to superficial observers a belief in his own infallibility. So that which made largely for his own strength helped to contribute to the failure of his purpose.[1]

[1] The following extract from Lord Lamington's *In the Days of the Dandies*, published in 1890, is an indication of the bewilderment which Urquhart caused to the ordinarily intelligent men of his time, and this in spite of the admiration they could not withhold.

Just as the East, with its apparently flaming contradictions, still remains an insoluble enigma to the West—so was it with Urquhart and his contemporaries.

"There were a great number of people," says Lord Lamington, "and those men of ability and consideration, who regarded Urquhart as a prophet—as the founder of a new dispensation. His was a strange career. He was Secretary at Constantinople during Lord Ponsonby's embassy; he then adopted quite the Oriental life, and his influence entirely superseded the ambassador's. This led to violent scenes, and Urquhart was recalled; this was in the reign of William IV., who became acquainted with Urquhart, and at once was subject to his influence. Had the King lived, that influence would have affected any Government. At this time, the *Portfolio*, a collection of documents on foreign affairs, was edited and written by Urquhart. It produced a great sensation in the diplomatic world, not only by the new light it threw on many political and social questions, but from the keen observations and ability of the writer. It contained from time to time passages of singular beauty and remarkable foresight.

"I remember when he foretold our terrible Afghanistan disasters of 1841, he wrote (I quote from memory): 'I warn you in this midnight of your intoxication, a day-dawn of sorrow is at hand; and, although my voice is now raised in vain, and my words find no responsive echo in your hearts, they will sink into your spirits when they are broken and subdued by misfortune.'

"His chief work, *The Spirit of the East*, possesses great merit. He was entirely master of the Eastern question; and on his own evidence, like the poet, he wandered eastward, not now and then, but in his daily life. His house at Watford (Rickmansworth) was an Eastern palace, with a Turkish bath (for it was Mr. Urquhart who introduced Turkish baths into this country), which in luxuriousness was inferior to none in Constantinople. . . .

"He expended all the fortune he inherited, and the large sums he received from his many followers, on missions and couriers to all parts of the world. Through him the world was to be renewed. Never was a greater instance how faith in oneself can affect others.

Another contributing cause of failure was the violence of Urquhart's own temper. Everyone who came into contact with him, whether in public or private life, suffered from it. Sometimes he simulated passionate wrath, of set purpose, to provoke antagonism fierce enough to dethrone indifference and force his intended convert to meet him in the open field.

But, apart from this, David Urquhart was naturally passionate, impatient of contradiction, destructive of all that opposed him. His temper was part of his physical equipment. An organisation of the most sensitive and a brain particularly active were combined with a strong tendency to a malady which always lay in wait for him, and was always threatening to overtake him. He spent days and nights racked with pain, for which he found no relief except in the Turkish bath.[1] It is probable that complete self-control was an impossibility to him. Sometimes he would behave with the most astonishing gentleness, patience, and self-restraint under the most flagrant rudeness and insolence, and would take the trouble to argue with people whom most men would have treated with the contempt of silence.

On another occasion the least opposition would rouse him to real violence, and he would terrify the working men, as he did his own children, by sudden outbursts of passion. The men and women of his own class fared no better. People who had devoted themselves and their fortunes to the work, who had sacrificed their friends and health, and who gave to their leader the most unswerving loyalty and almost passionate devotion, were content if now and then a word of praise sweetened the many bitter potions of criticism on work, conduct, and character which he administered. Some of them made long journeys to his Savoy retreat, only to be taken to task most sternly; some

---

Although he has long passed away from public life, his memory survives among many who are interested in foreign affairs.

"The Foreign Affairs Committees of Newcastle and many large towns still exist, and have not lost faith in the great master, with whom they were always in constant communication. . . ."

[1] Wherever he lived he had a Turkish bath, which was not only for the use of himself and his household, but whoever amongst the working men he thought might be benefited by it. At his mountain house in Savoy the bath was open to all the peasants and mountaineers who cared to use it.

spent money like water, only to be told they had not given enough; some journeyed East and West and North and South on the mission of their leader, only to be accused of half-heartedness in the cause. Collet, who had led a life of effort in the interests of the freedom of the Press, was constantly rated like a schoolboy for mistakes and failures in the difficult task of editing the *Diplomatic Review*.

Yet to most of his adherents, to the end of his life, Urquhart was the Bey, the Chief, the Prophet, almost the "sent of God." To his own little daughter dreaming of her father, suffering as he often did hard speeches and contemptuous treatment at the hands of those to whom his political justice and truth was a continual reproach, it did not seem strange that that same father should change after the strange fashion of dreams, into the Christ. "It is really the same thing, is it not, mother?" she said.

Yet even to his children Urquhart showed no softness. He was as stern in his demands on them as on his disciples. If he visited their beds when they were asleep, to see if he could detect in their faces traces of the passionate temper that was the result of his own ill-health, they never knew. They could not tell that it hurt him when they hushed their play as he came near. They could not recognise the signs of the a'ways sensitive affection of his nature, an affection not less real because so sternly held in check. What wonder that a nature so repressed should be an enigma to all around, that a life spent always in harness on the battlefield should seem to fail on the human side?

And yet, in the human heart, deep always calls to deep. The affection and courage and passion for goodness of that great heart did cry aloud. His passionate assertion that perfection was possible called out the craving for it in others. Even those who did not understand were attracted. His friends of whatever class, in their deepest anger against him, were often held to him by bonds they could not break.

He made enormous demands on all with whom he came in contact, and those demands the Elect could not resist, for they were made in the name of Perfection.

PART III

HOW HE WENT TO ROME TO BRING JUSTICE DOWN FROM HEAVEN

"Filii tui de longe venient."—*Isaiah* lx.

"He lives detachèd days;
He serveth not for praise;
For gold
He is not sold.

"Deaf is he to world's tongue;
He scorneth for his song
The loud
Shouts of the crowd.

"He asketh not world's eyes;
Not to world's ears he cries;
Saith, 'These
Shut, if you please.'

"He measureth world's pleasure,
World's ease, as Saints might measure;
For hire
Just love entire

"He asks, not grudging pain;
And knows his asking vain,
And cries—
'Love! Love!' and dies,

"In guerdon of long duty,
Unowned by Love or Beauty."

FRANCIS THOMSON: *To the Dead Cardinal of Westminster.*

CHAPTER IX

URQUHART AND HIS EARLIER RELATIONS TO ROME

"A city set on a hill."

It was in 1839, when England was on the brink of a Chartist rising more serious, as Urquhart believed, than people generally imagined, that his mind, in its search for some strong international Power founded on Law and able to combat the prevailing lawlessness, seems to have first lighted upon the Society of Jesus.

One evening, when he and some of his friends were discussing the situation with Cardo and Warden, there chanced to come in

"some gentlemen lately arrived from Munich, one of them a Mr. Bamfield, Librarian to the King of Bohemia, who stated that great alarm existed throughout Germany, and indeed throughout Europe, at the progress and power of Russia, and that a national organisation was forming to oppose her. . . . Mr. Urquhart made some remarks with reference to the Jesuits, to the effect that they might be led to abandon the small objects they had in view, for those far greater and nobler ends if they once understood them; and that as an organised body, powerful and intelligent, unless they were led to employ their talents and their power to oppose Russia, they would be made to employ them, as they now unconsciously did, for her. . . . "These gentlemen were terrified at the notion, having the greatest horror of anything relating to Popery, and did not conceive it possible."[1]

Two months later Urquhart determined to make trial for himself of its possibilities. Arriving at Preston in his anti-Chartist campaign, it occurred to him to turn aside and visit Stonyhurst. In his journal he gives the following account of his visit:

[1] Private letter by Colonel Pringle Taylor.

"Went by the railway to Preston to go to Stonyhurst. Asked at Preston at the house of one of the Jesuit priests to get directions. Was taken to a Mr. Barroll, who, on learning my errand, very civilly afforded every information. He did not disappoint me in my ideas of a Jesuit—observant, deep tone of voice, jet black hair. As I quitted him he begged to know my name, and on giving my card he immediately asked me if I had any introduction. On my reply that I had not, he offered to write a letter for me to take with me for fear of any mistake or any delay. I went in the meantime to the inn to get some dinner, and Mr. Barroll himself came with his note for Stonyhurst. We entered into conversation, and my departure was consequently delayed, so as to occasion me a very uncomfortable night. Finding Mr. Barroll a man of considerable information and reading, of a philosophical and metaphysical character, I was induced to enter with him on the object of my visit to Stonyhurst, and the rather because if I should find there men, not his superiors, but his inferiors, it would have been so much gained to have gone over the subject with some one of the Order and to have left some traces behind me of the purpose of my visit. I consequently shadowed forth to him the dependence of the Papal Power as a temporal Sovereignty on the Public Law of Nations, and the obligation that the Pope therefore had to maintain it for his own defence, and that, whatever his religious position, he must, as a temporal Sovereign, have at heart the welfare of England, since through England alone could he hope to be maintained against that territorial preponderance which had driven his predecessor from his throne; against that general disorganisation, which proceeded from the diplomatic combinations of the Cabinet of the North; that Russia was a spiritual, as well as a political, conqueror, that she aimed no less at subverting the temporal dominion of England than the spiritual dominion of Rome; that the present Pope had appreciated the hostility of Russia;[1] had placed himself in a position of warfare with that dangerous Power; that he had therefore to anticipate my conclusions, but that he must be ignorant of the value of the discovery he had made, of the Allies who were ready to cluster round him, of the elements he

[1] In 1842, Gregory XVI. put forth an "exposition corroborated by documents respecting the incessant care given by His Holiness to remedy the Grave Evils by which the Catholic Religion is afflicted in the Imperial and Royal States of Russia and Poland."

might call to his assistance. The Kaliff of the Mussulman, the Pontifex of the Catholics, and the Head of the Protestant Faith were all at once openly and avowedly assailed by one Power, which had not only succeeded in injuring all and endangering all, but in preventing each from communing with each other or understanding itself. The question was to put the Pope in possession of that knowledge and of these means, and to show him Turkey, England, Austria, as capable of being united and directed by any superior intelligence comprehending these questions.

"Having thus unfolded some portion of my thoughts I proceeded towards the College, a distance of fourteen miles, the roads exceedingly bad, the fog preventing us seeing a foot before us. I arrived too late for being admitted, and had to return to a small public-house on the road. The aspect of the buildings, however, the character of its inhabitants, their connection with that widespread field, embracing reminiscences of China and Paraguay, my own anticipations of ability in the Superior and the great results which might come from this visit, all conspired to raise my expectations. The interest of my thoughts recalled to me forcibly the approaching in the East to the tenements or mansions of distinct sects, faiths, and races, diversified ideas, habits, language, doctrines, and metaphysics, and as I approached next morning the towers of Stonyhurst I felt an anticipation and delight in human intercourse such as I had never before felt except in the East.

"I was admitted. A gentleman came to me and told me that the Principal was at that moment engaged, and that he would in the meantime show me round the building, which is indeed exceedingly interesting, both in its present application and its past reminiscences. I told this Father briefly my object in the interest I had taken in public affairs, adding that I did so that it might enable the Superior to direct himself to these subjects if he took any interest in them. . . .

"The Superior appeared, and all idea of communicating with him on any subject of the kind instantly vanished. He could not even tell me the names of the philosophical writers in their own course of study. I need not pursue the matter further. One of the Fathers I found acquainted with the philosophical works and writers on the Continent. He had studied Sanscrit, and was then studying Chinese, but he was a man rather advanced in years, and afflicted with paralysis.

"The people in the neighbourhood I found strongly prepossessed in favour of Catholicism, where they had not turned Catholics.

"I see no advantage which the Jesuits have over the Church save the bad name of their Order and a certain degree of mere suavity and politeness.

"I could not altogether resist the temptation of giving vent to my disappointment. On one of them referring to their Order in former times, I remarked that it was impossible for him to comprehend the Jesuits of that time: 'It is not the privilege of men to comprehend that which is above them, and you can no more comprehend your predecessors than Englishmen at the present day can understand what Englishmen were. I came here thinking you were Jesuits, but find you mere Englishmen.'"

His disappointment in the English Jesuits, though it resulted in his abandonment of any hope of help through them, for that time, at least, did not destroy Urquhart's growing conviction that in the Catholic Church lay the power, if she chose to exert it, through which political salvation might come to the world.

England, which still maintained some idea of Law and Justice, was losing it in the deadly grip of that most fatal of all heresies: the belief that religion had no concern with politics—a heresy which was the root and fruit of the Peace of Westphalia, and with which all Protestantism was infected.[1]

There were, he pointed out, three religious systems in the world, which counted for good or evil, and these three were in their nature religio-political. In the first of these, the Greek Church, which acknowledged as its head and dictator the Czar of Russia, religion was made to serve the uses of politics; she had therefore become a menace to the world. In Islam, whose Kaliff was the Sultan of Turkey, religion controlled each act of the daily life of its members as well as the public life of the State; its influence was therefore

[1] As a matter of fact, Catholicism was also infected—but only in her practice, not yet in her doctrine. That could never be unless she were to disown her own traditions. The political salvation of the world still lies in Catholics remembering them, and acting upon them.

on the side of Justice. But it was in the Catholic Church that there was to be found the most perfect example of the balance of religious and political power. The Pope—the greatest of spiritual rulers—was also one of the lowliest of earthly Kings. The King in him could never overshadow the Priest; never could he, with any chance of success, call his kingly power to the aid of his priestly authority. Unless the basis of his rule was Justice and Law, unless his sceptre was over the hearts and thoughts of men, it was weak as a reed.

Because he was a King the Pope could set a standard to the nations, because his kingly power gave no pretext for force and no scope for ambition, he could set the standard of Law and Justice. He could do it the better because his was no inherited royalty.

"He does not pass through the emasculating process of royal birth and pretensions; he is not gradually woven into the system either of social habits or of political expediency or of diplomatic subserviency.

"The Pope, translated from the cloister, carries, or may carry, to the Imperial throne the manhood of the peasant and the sternness of the anchorite."[1]

In the hands of a Pope of transcendent moral character and high intelligence the Papacy had been, and might be again, a power for good in the world against which no evil could stand.

But, it might be asked, in what way could a King, beset on all hands by foes, with an army so insignificant as to be little more than a bodyguard, a royalty so feeble as to be the sport of any great potentate who might arise, whose sole power was in the thoughts of men—how could such an one exercise any appreciable power for good or evil?

It was precisely because of the immaterial nature of the power, said Urquhart, that it was so potent. Because his Kingdom was not of this world, because his power lay, not in arms, but in Justice, his arms must be the arms of the

[1] "The Three Religio-Political Systems of Europe," *Portfolio*, Second Series.

mind—in other words, diplomacy. The word "diplomacy" had come to have a sinister meaning, but in itself it was innocent alike of good or evil. It was a weapon which could be turned to base or noble uses. It was for the Pope to take it and with it to fight for the right. At present Europe was suffering under the exercise of the diplomacy of evil. Russia, the past mistress of diplomacy in Europe, had gained her ends, "in spite of a weak and disjointed Government at home, replete with every element of discord, and destitute of every one of the elements of strength, by which the other Powers had attained to their strength."

They were her superiors in every other respect, but they had been, over and over again, as clay in her hands because of her superiority in diplomacy. Every man in her Cabinet was a trained diplomatist, but her diplomacy was evil, and its influence maleficent. It was a "Satanic[1] intelligence walking the upper world as a pestilence spreading through the brain of man."

It had infected every Power in Europe; Rome alone was untouched by it because, by the Peace of Westphalia, she had been banished from the charmed circle of European politics, and her banishment had been ratified and confirmed by the Treaty of Vienna. She had accepted and gloried in her exclusion by refusing to be a party to that Treaty. The defiance she alone in Europe had hurled at Napoleon, her strong protest against the breach of public Law committed by Russia in the persecution of her Catholic subjects,[2] had put the Vatican definitely on the side of Law and Justice. In making, therefore, Law and Justice the basis of a new and higher system of diplomacy, she would not be forced, as every other State in Europe would be, to disown her former policy, and to have to retrace her steps. "Diplomacy in Venice," said Urquhart, "was worldly wisdom, diplomacy to Louis XIV. was an aspect

[1] "On the Relation of the Eastern and Western Churches," *Portfolio*. New Series.

[2] The first protest issued by Gregory XVI. to the Czar against the persecution of his Catholic subjects, particularly the Poles. In his protest the Pope took his stand *not* on the Treaty of Vienna, but on Public Law and Justice.

of military power, diplomacy in Russia is the science of corrupting and discomposing States.[1] Diplomacy in the Court of Rome must be the restoration and the union of the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove. . . . If after-ages should ever speak of the diplomacy of Rome, history will have to record the reunion in this century of religion and politics, and it will have to describe the diplomacy of a Church, not of a State, which has appeared upon earth counteracting the powers of darkness, as a Providence protecting the human race."

But Urquhart well saw that the preliminary step to a theocratic diplomacy such as this was the training of the diplomatist. He had at first cherished the idea that the Jesuits might put some of the elaborately constructed machinery of their educational system to such a purpose, but his visit to Stonyhurst had been the death-blow of that hope. He determined to approach the Vatican directly.

Through his friend Anstey[2] he obtained an introduction to Cardinal Capaccini, the Papal Nuncio to Portugal, who, in 1844, visited London on his return to Rome, that he

[1] If newspapers can be believed, this is still the case in Bolshevik Russia. The following paragraph appeared in the *Observer*, May 18, 1919.

STOCKHOLM,
Saturday.

The *Svenska Dagblad's* Helsingfors correspondent reports that the Russian Soviet Government has sent its representatives abroad the following instructions on how to conduct the revolutionary movement in foreign countries:

"In order to create international conflicts, the best method is to support national fanaticism, effect interior dissension, and commit attempts against the lives of foreign Government representatives. As regards internal policy, anti-Government movements should be started, strikes organised, influential persons abused, and industrial machinery destroyed, in order to raise revolt. Efforts should also be made to effect the stagnation of traffic, prevent the supply of provisions to towns, and set false paper money into circulation.

"It is further advisable to try to create complete dissension within the Army by means of agitation, murderous attempts against high officers, and the blowing up of bridges and depots of arms. Military espionage of every description should be practised in regard to fortifications, naval technical equipment, and the numerical strength and morale of the Army."—REUTER.

[2] See Note to Chapter VII., p. 143.

might report to the ecclesiastical authorities on the condition of Catholicism in England.

Capaccini's interview with David Urquhart had in it certain dramatic elements.

It is a truism that Italian ecclesiastics find it hard to understand Englishmen, even English Catholics. But it must have been more than usually surprising to this Cardinal Nuncio of Portugal to be suddenly confronted by an Englishman, obviously not one of the prominent Catholics, whom it might be his duty to interview, who declined to be rebuffed, and who opened the conversation by warning him that between England, heretical England, and Rome there lay intermingling strands of policy, that they were united by a common danger, and a common safety. But soon Urquhart's words woke in the mind of the Italian an answering chord, for Capaccini was a statesman, and he knew that the things of which his interlocutor spoke were true.

"It is a manifest and great danger," he answered, as Urquhart spoke of the great power of the evil diplomacy which was the menace of Europe, particularly of Rome and of England, each in her own way standing for Justice. "It is a great danger, but it is irresistible."

"When Europe possesses in its humblest State a Minister who is honest, Europe and you will learn," said Urquhart, "that the power of Russia is not irresistible, but most easily met and overcome."

"But surely," said Capaccini, "some of the great European statesmen are equal to the task?"

"Nothing," said Urquhart, "but honesty and knowledge are equal to the task. Look what these men are in the judgment of the Muscovites—what in their hands. You look upon yourself as an Italian, upon me as an Englishman. To the Muscovite we are one and the other, only 'Schwabes,' the mute, the brute, and they are right. Europe stands in respect of these barbarous races of the North as the Roman Empire in the sixth century did in respect to our forefathers, but with the difference that our forefathers had not the art, and had not the corruption of the civilisation of the times, while the modern barbarians unite the withering corruption and the destroying art and science of the most advanced civilisation with the

destructive energies and the all-grasping cupidity of barbarians."

"What, then, are we to do?" asked Capaccini, leaning forward intently, with both hands on the arms of his chair.

So was Urquhart brought to the point for which he had sought this interview.

"That question," he replied, "and the manner in which you ask it, brings back to my mind the very same words addressed to me by my Sovereign,[1] and I will repeat to you the answer which I was inspired to give him. I did not say to him, 'Adopt this measure; take that course; do this thing or that;' but I replied, 'Form men.' I said, 'Send a few young men prepared with the requisite study of International Right and Public Law to a practical examination of things and men. . . . You suffer, not from want of strength, but from the danger of mistaking your way.' This I now say to you, with the difference in the application making its adoption the more easy. You have not the idea of armies and fleets. You have no veil from danger, or pretext for indifference. You are directly assailed."

Urquhart had three interviews with Capaccini when he was in England, and they parted with many expressions of confidence and regard on the Cardinal's part.[2]

[1] William IV.

[2] Mr. Anstey had a private interview with Cardinal Capaccini, during the course of which he asked if there was any point on which the Cardinal would wish for further information.

Cardinal Capaccini: "Only one thing I would like you to ascertain from him (*i.e.*, Urquhart), whether he is satisfied with me, for I am quite satisfied with him."

Mr. Anstey: "Mr. Urquhart is not one of us."

Cardinal Capaccini: "He is a good Catholic against Russia."

Mr. Anstey: "I believed that I stood alone amongst the Catholics, and until I knew Mr. Urquhart and his friends, I thought I stood alone amongst the inhabitants of Britain in the sense that I have ever entertained of judging of public events by the same rule that I might apply to my own private conduct. I considered myself as living alone in this island with these feelings, until I met that man. The difference between him and me depends upon the difference rather of the roads by which we have come to our present conclusions: I, through seeking what ought to be my duty as a Catholic; he, as an Englishman. He has those who fully feel and act with him who are not Englishmen—some French, some English, some Mussulmans: and naturally so, for it is the question of that which is the basis

He undertook to set afoot a scheme for a Diplomatic College in Rome, and to prepare Urquhart's way with the Holy Father. He fulfilled his engagements and seems to have conveyed to the Court of the Vatican his own feelings of confidence in the wisdom of Urquhart's policy, with the result that the English Protestant was invited to Rome to confer with the Holy Father. He was on his way thither when Gregory XVI. died. He turned back; once again his plans were frustrated.

On the need for men engaged in the Diplomatic Service to be trained in Public Law and in the practical conduct of affairs, Urquhart never ceased to insist, from the time when he had urged it on William IV. to the end of his life. He reiterated the need of it to Pius IX., in an Italy torn by convulsions and revolution; even when the Temporal Power had been entirely lost, he never ceased to press it on him as the first step to the re-establishment of Public Law and Justice in Europe.

Urquhart's method is still waiting to be tried. Meanwhile, Diplomacy has not grown more honest, standing armies have not decreased, nor have wars ceased. The dream of a reign of Justice, that was to banish the reign of Force, which buoyed us up during the war, retreats farther and farther into the distance.

There is still no forming of men for Diplomacy. International lawyers we have. They are present at Peace Conferences, presumably to clear up the obscure language, which, by no accident, finds its way into treaties. But they are unrepresented at embassies, they are not consulted as to whether private arrangements between nations are in accord with Public Law; no mention is ever made of their being consulted even before a Declaration of War.

Moreover, it is a moot question whether the real founda-

---

of all national existence, as of all religious obligation, against that which is the perversion of the one and the other. And all those who have come to this conclusion, Turks, Protestants, English, French, look to the Pope as the only European Potentate from which can proceed the authoritative enunciation of these doctrines, or the practical resistance to the evils which follow from their neglect."

tions of Public Law and morality are taken into account, even among modern so-called international lawyers, or whether their concern is not wholly with the interpretation of treaties. In Urquhart's eyes treaties were but side issues; the main question of diplomacy was concerned with Public Justice based on Public Law. It was because the whole fate of Europe seemed to him to turn on the decision as to whether Public Law or lawlessness was to prevail, that he thought it the most important of the duties which devolved upon a Prince of the Church, or even upon the Head of Christendom himself, to strive to guide that decision right.

In 1846 Urquhart was still hopeful that something might be done in Rome. Italy, with its new ideas of national life, was for a moment at the feet of Pius IX., who had "breathed a new spirit into the Romans." Urquhart's friend, the Abbé Hamilton, wrote from Rome of the appointment of the new Papal Nuncio for Portugal,[1] who had promised to visit England on his way home if possible. The idea of a Diplomatic College in Rome had been put before him, and he had received it favourably.

Hamilton writes:

"Cardinal Ghizzi has promised to give very careful consideration to any hints you may give him as to the means of increasing the efficiency of the *Corps Diplomatique* in Rome. He is not the only person here who is aware of the want of education under which our statesmen suffer. A Congregation of Cardinals is considering the reformation of the Institute of Education, and may probably make some change which may render it efficient as a nursery of diplomatic talent."

Urquhart was very hopeful; there was a great muster of his friends in Rome just then. "Mr. Ross, of Bladensburg," he writes, "has succeeded in gaining Lord Clifford, who has sent me a message that he is glad to find himself embarked in the same boat; we have had very wild encounters lately. A new ally, Sir W. Stuart, started for

[1] Capaccini died suddenly, soon after his return to Rome.

Rome a few days ago, also Dr. Gillies, Roman Catholic Bishop of Edinburgh. Dr. Gillies is a man considerably above the ordinary level, and has, I find, preserved the recollection and impression of a conversation I had with him nine years ago. Dr. Ullathorne, Roman Catholic Bishop of the Western District, whom I never saw, but who has been studying the old *Portfolio* and preaching from it, has gone to Rome.

"General Manley, now an old associate, is also in London on his way to Rome, so that there will be a singular concentration of English opinion at Rome in our sense."

Mr. Urquhart sent the Cardinal Secretary of State a long and very elaborate account of the possibilities for the world in a new diplomacy at the Vatican.

"I hope," says Mr. Hamilton, "that some effect has been made. The Cardinal has, I believe, determined on the erection of a Diplomatic School in Rome, and he has taken the first step to it in the suppression of something, which was by way of supplying the candidates for the various Offices of State. It is his intention to reform the Ecclesiastical Academies in two years, and I hope that before that time you will have an opportunity of explaining to the Secretary of State in Rome your views on this important subject *viva voce*."

Pio Nono's reforming spirit was evident in every department of the Papal Government. The air around him was full of idealism, and his own ardent soul rose up to meet it, overleaping the bounds set by the sterilising inertia of the officials of the old régime. Italy was at one with her Spiritual Head as she had not been for centuries.

But it was upon this very romance and generosity of spirit that the foes of the Papal Power were calculating. They were scattering broadcast insinuations, hints and innuendoes, trying to stir up jealousy and strife alike amongst his friends and his foes.

Ross writes from Rome:

"I cannot subscribe to the judgment you pass on the late Pope,[1] nor is the statement of d'Azeglio correct, that

[1] I.e. that he was against reform of any kind in the administration of the Papal States.

Austria called on him to make the reforms now contemplated by the present Pope. The reverse, I am informed, is the fact. Cardinal Cappelari had expectations of being raised to the Pontificate after the death of Leo XII. Consequently he had digested his plans, and amongst his papers since his death have been found arrangements for reforms more extensive and searching than appear, as far as we can judge, to be anticipated at present. The popular outbursts following the French Occupation of 1830 gave an ascendancy to Austria, which she used to prevent these reforms from taking place, and Gregory, after having n vain wrestled against Austrian influence in his Cabinet, was obliged to succumb and let things go their way. . . . I am puzzled as to the influence that raised Pius IX. to the Pontificate. At any rate, I cannot think that his elevation was displeasing to the brigand Powers, for the simple reason that, as he was a man that never expected to be so raised, he had not any plans matured. The Amnesty was the result of his having perceived the failure of the system pursued while Bishop of Imola. . . . I fear that his popularity will impede his freedom in more senses than one. The situation he is thereby placed in, in regard to Austria, is stated to me as a reason for not doing what the present crisis demands. The over-sanguineness will lead to its disappointing itself."

Ross's fears were justified. The great ideas afloat in Italy had not wings strong enough to bear very far or very high. Pius IX. woke from his dream of a free and federated Italy to find it darkened by the fear of bloodshed, to find that there was no cohesion or unity except in fiery speeches. Among the Italian States only Venice showed herself capable of realising on what had depended her ancient freedom, her ancient glory. Italy was defenceless in the face of revolution and counter-revolution. The idea of a United Kingdom under the House of Savoy could never be realised with Charles Albert as leader. Those who, like Gioberti and Rosmini, dreamed of a Confederate Italy under the Pope, saw their vision killed by foes in the household of the Church. Divided in herself, and a prey to revolutionaries of all nationalities, Italy was no match for Austria—even an Austria distracted by troubles at home.

But the fatal blow to the great ideal was struck when Pius IX., who had already drawn back from a contest with Austria, called in the aid of France against an anarchy he could not stem. Many who had hailed him as the deliverer of Italy, and acclaimed him as the leader under whose banner she was again to be united and free, became his bitterest foes, and the day of the final loss of his sovereignty in Italy grew perceptibly nearer.

Pius IX., however, in drawing back from leading a general revolt of Italy against Austria, had taken his stand upon the Law of Nations. It was the only firm ground, when the earth was rocking with corruption, and the air was thick with lying rumours. No plot was too dishonest, no treachery too foul wherewith to bolster up a patriotic scheme, or to undermine the position of a foe. Looking back upon it now, it seems as though the Pope, were he to remain master of his own soul, must have stood clear of the whole struggle. Rome was the storm-centre of Italy and of Europe. Only Venice succeeded in riding the whirlwind, in obtaining and even keeping for a time her independence with honesty and good faith.

Urquhart has been accused of being opposed to Italian Unity. It is therefore interesting to be able to quote some part of a letter of congratulation which he wrote in 1848 to the noble President of the new Venetian Republic, Daniele Manin, on the little State's great achievement:

"At a moment when your country's fate depends upon the direction which the Provisional Government shall give to the first movements of the State, you may not be indisposed to listen to the suggestions of one who has laboriously explored in its various fields the traces of Venetian enterprise. . . . In the past greatness and weakness of Venice I distinguish two remarkable features—causes of the one, and evidences of the other. The first regards commerce, the second diplomacy! In both she presents the very contrast to the present European system. The greatness which she achieved, the ruin with which they are now overwhelmed, would justify a stranger people in eschewing their practice and adopting their maxims. How much more you, who are Venice, and have cast off Austria!

"Venice taxed no foreign produce or manufactures. In modern Europe science consists in that method of raising a revenue. . . .

"Venice made Diplomacy the very foundation of her State, and therefore, small as she was, she obtained ascendancy over mighty potentates.

"In Modern Europe Diplomacy is in truth unknown, yet the whispers of diplomatists are all-powerful. Secret conclaves rule the world, and the nations neither know why or how.

"If Venice be indeed again a Republic, let that Republic be Venice."

CHAPTER X

"UNITED ITALY"

"O Pater, O Hominum divumque æterna potestas—
Namque aliud quid sit, quod jam implorare queamus?—
Cernis ut insultent Rutuli."

Æneid, Book X., 18–20.

WHATEVER sympathy Urquhart felt with the natural aspirations of the Italian States for freedom from the bondage of Austria, however he may have been disposed to admire the spirit of union against a common foe, and the willingness of Piedmont to merge her own personality in that of an Italian kingdom, his admiration, even had it been able to survive the many breaches, open and covert, of the Law of Nations by which the War of Liberation was brought to a successful issue, must have been turned to contempt by the mingled treachery and effrontery of the attack on the Kingdom of Naples by the ill-assorted Triumvirate, Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi; a contempt which grew white hot with indignation and scorn during those ten years after the entry of Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi side by side into Naples, when the Italian Government, Catholic in name, was doing its utmost to starve and kill the Catholic Church in its own dominions, by robbing her of her possessions, and subjecting her to every kind of petty persecution, while it sat and watched with hungry eyes for the time to come when it could cast to the wind its promises, tear up the Convention it had signed with the intention of destroying it, and seize upon and secularise the States of the Church.

We may not agree with him in regarding the setting up of an Italian Kingdom as the triumph of Russian diplomacy in the South of Europe, as the seizure of the Duchies had been in the North. But it was a view entirely con-

sistent with the idea he had formed while he was in the East, of Russia's determination to create for herself a strong sphere of influence in the Mediterranean. For five-and-twenty years before the outbreak of the war he had been constantly concerned to connect Russia with the outbreak of European Revolution, particularly in the South, and more especially in France and Italy.

" To me," he said, " the key of her operations has been the direct object of Russia, which can be traced back to 1793, of obtaining Sicily, positions on the coast of the Adriatic, and the Greek Islands."

Her great stumbling-block was, he declared, as it had been Napoleon's, the Papacy; and he prophesied that she would not leave a stone unturned until she had crushed the sovereign power of the Pope.

Few figures in history have stood out with so much dignity and grandeur as Pius IX. during the ten years which preceded the final loss of the *Imperium Civile.* Neither the wounds of his friends, the blows of his enemies, nor the insults of the indifferent could break down the silent majesty in which he wrapped himself. Betrayed and despised, he was still the most heroic figure in Europe, and that Urquhart recognised him as such, when the world around had been taken captive by much shouting and a little glamour, is no mean testimony to his own greatness.

But if he admired the Pope, whom it was the fashion to execrate, he hated what most men loved.

The English passion for vagueness had, from the beginning of Mazzini's career, been taken captive by his verbose phrases about God and religion.[1] In the man who, in the eyes of the godly men of his own country, was doing the work of the Devil, persecuting priests, hunting down religion, turning places consecrated by centuries of prayer to

[1] Words were Mazzini's great weapon. In an address to the " Friends of Italy," given in Paris in October, 1844, he says:

" There are regenerative words which contain all that need be often repeated to the people. Liberty, Rights of Men, Progress, Equality, Fraternity, are what the people will understand; above all when opposed to the words Despotism, Privileges, Tyranny, Slavery, etc !"

secular uses, Englishmen of all classes saw a saintly ascetic, who had given up home, country, friends, for the sake of Freedom.

The sentimentalist was enthralled by the spectacle of the great exiled patriot holding classes for the religious and moral instruction of the Italian organ-grinders in London. To him there was great profundity in the long harangues in which "God" and "the People," "Religion" and "Liberty," were placed in appealing juxtaposition.

But when Urquhart read them, he said: "This means but one thing, Disorder, Revolution, utter want of a moral sense concealed behind vague religious sentiment."

In 1863 he wrote to a friend, who had been greatly attracted by the renewed glamour of Mazzini's exploits as Garibaldi's adjutor in Sicily:

"As to what I myself directly know in reference to Mazzini, the whole is to be found worked out in the species of judicial examination of myself which took place at Birmingham in 1855, on which occasion were produced the letters and statements of Kossuth and Mazzini in attempted justification of themselves; and on the perusal of which the Committee was dissolved, the Chairman, Mr. George Dawson, of Birmingham, observing: 'After that, I have nothing more to say.'

"But I have no objection to relate from memory what occurred on the one occasion when I met Mazzini to his face. It was in the year 1842 or 1843. Mr. Anstey had been talking to me of him, and as he expressed himself to me in terms which I have scarcely ever heard used of a human being, I was alarmed in reference to Mr. Anstey's judgment and passions; and more with that in view than anything else, I made up my mind to see him myself, if I could possibly do so without his knowing me.

"I applied to Mr. Szulcheski, Secretary to the Polish Association, mentioning the occasion and my purpose. He procured for me Mr. Mazzini's address. I went thither. It was, I think, a street running parallel to Portland Place. Inquiring for him, a message was brought down from him asking my name. I replied that I was a stranger to him, and yet desired to see him; but yet, if he had any objections, it in no way mattered. The maid-servant returned with an invitation to walk upstairs.

"I said on entering: 'I have no excuse for this intrusion save this, that I am an Englishman, and desire to hear you talk about Italy.' His look of inquisitive distrust was immediately exchanged for extreme *empressement*. He placed for me a chair, and seating himself opposite to me across a small round table, invited me to question him. I commenced with the year 1816, and, once launched, he applied himself to expound events historically, I having no other idea at the time than that of endeavouring to fathom the character of the man.

"When coming to the affair of Modena in the year 1827, a conversation I had had with Davidovitch and Petronievitch at Cravovitz suddenly flashed across me, and I said, interrupting him: 'So it was *then* that you (meaning the Revolutionists) sent your Deputation to the Emperor of Russia at Vosnogenk?'

"He threw himself back as if he had received a blow, and after a time faltered out 'Yes,' and remained silent.

"That silence I broke by these words: 'How do you reconcile yourselves to receive Russian money?'

"By this time he had recovered himself. He smilingly answered: 'There is no love lost between us. We know her, and do not trust her; but we are on the same line.' I asked what that line was.

"He replied, 'Disorder!'

"Rising, I said: 'I have now to thank you. I have obtained all I desired,' and left him, rooted in amazement. . . .

"I may say that subsequent to the investigation of this matter at Birmingham, something of a similar nature took place at Newcastle, when a Pole named Stanislas Worcell testified to his having heard Mazzini mentioning a meeting having taken place between him and me.

"You may like to know what it is I had heard from Davidovitch and Petronievitch in Servia. It was this:

"They had received the orders of the Prince (Milosch) to make me a confession of the whole intercourse that had taken place between Servia and Russia, all which has been fully detailed by me in a report to Government at the time,[1] but of which I do not find a copy amongst my papers, although there is repeated reference to it in the correspondence with Sir Herbert Taylor.[2] It is, therefore, to my

[1] Foreign Office Papers. Turkey 249.
[2] Private Secretary to William IV.

memory alone that I must now trust after an interval of thirty years.

"They told me that in the year 1827 one or both of them had been amongst the deputies sent by Servia to meet the Emperor at a review at Vosnogenk; that after their audience in the Emperor's tent he had turned round and caused some gentlemen in dark clothes to advance; and then, turning to the Servian deputies, uttered these words: 'These gentlemen are the representatives of the first peoples in Europe, to whom the rest owe whatever light they possess; and here they are come to seek Liberty and Independence from those whom the people of Europe call barbarians.'

"To the best of my recollection the word Italy was not so much as mentioned, nor am I aware that at the time I had any idea of the connection between Italy and Russia. My present impression is that that connection only struck me in the course of Mazzini's narrative."

His attitude towards the other representatives of Italian Unity was even more contemptuous. In 1867 he sent to one of the leading newspapers a letter, the title of which, "Garibaldians and Fenians," sufficiently indicates the purport.

The paper returned it with the remark: "Very excellent, but wholly inadmissible into any English paper printed to be sold. The key-note would cause the very stones of the town to fly about the heads of the proprietors."

The press, as a matter of fact, would now have nothing to do with Urquhart; no newspaper would publish his letters, or the letters of his friends on the state of affairs in Italy—so opposed were they to the mass of public opinion which the Government was carefully fostering.[1]

[1] The following letter, taken from the *Free Press*, November 2, 1864, is one of many that Urquhart received from friends in Italy during this time. It shows, as they all do, the immense discrepancy between fact and fancy in the popular ideas on the Papal Government, and the feeling of his subjects for the Pope:

THE POPE AND HIS SUBJECTS.

To the Editor of the "Free Press."

SIR,—An observation which occurred in a recent number of a daily newspaper intimated that the demonstrations of loyalty and affection manifested towards Pius IX., on his return to Rome from a

"There is indeed a History besides," wrote Mrs. Urquhart to a friend on the subject of the Garibaldian enlistments, "a History which would take volumes in this particular case: I mean Garibaldi and Italy: how, through long years, the minds of Englishmen have been prepared for the events of the last by a systematic supply of false news and suppression of the truth as regards the country, in the year 1860 to be acted upon; how the most influential members of the Press (secretly working with my husband as many do) have declared it impossible to get in a line in a contrary sense, that is a single line that was not abusive, except in some obscure provincial papers."

Anyone who either remembers or who has read of the white-hot fever of excitement into which all classes of English society worked themselves over Garibaldi—how his very dress was imitated, his tokens and colours worn by fine ladies, how Cabinet Ministers threw propriety to the winds in their praises of exploits which, if they had been

summer excursion, did not originate in the sentiment of the people but were prompted and organised by the authorities. If you do me the honour to accept my testimony, as an eye-witness of many demonstrations in that city, and especially during six months lately spent there, I shall indicate a different conclusion.

I might allude to various occasions on which I was witness of popular manifestations of feeling towards the Pope on his visits to churches or institutions, when there was no circumstance to attract as a pageant, nor, beyond the presence of the Pontiff, to render them interesting. Crowds poured into the streets on his way, and filled the large piazzas of the SS. Apostoli or the Gesu. I particularly noticed that all classes were represented, and all equally demonstrative.

One of the greatest and most picturesque demonstrations was made on the annual visit of the Pope in state and procession, on the 25th of last March, to the Dominican Church in the Piazza della Minerva, where, according to an ancient custom, he bestows marriage portions on a number of young women.

From the Papal residence to the Piazza, the streets were hung with flags and devices, houses were decorated, and green leaves and flowers were strewn on the procession, and loyalty and devotion were evinced by the people in every form of Italian grace and fervour. But it happened on this occasion that, through certain streets inhabited by the working classes, there was more than ordinary excitement. For the agents of the anti-papal party, who all the winter had, to our great edification at their veracity, proclaimed through their organs in the Press of North and South Italy—which were echoed by our own—"the dangerous illness and approaching death of the Pope," now circulated a report that he was actually dead, but that the fact was carefully withheld. They affirmed that in the

performed in Ireland instead of Italy, would have been visited with all the vengeance of the outraged majesty of the English law; how young men, peers and workmen alike, rushed to enlist in his army—will understand that Urquhart's attitude must have robbed him of every vestige of the influence he still possessed in England—except, indeed, amongst the negligible minority, who still counted Law and Justice dearer than Romance and Sentiment and grandiloquent phrases.

The days when *The Times*, the *Morning Advertiser*, the *Herald*, in fact, most of the leading papers, had been glad to publish a series of letters from Urquhart's pen had long passed. One after another they had thrown him over, as he attacked idol after idol dear to the English heart. Now, however, not only did he heap scorn and contempt on popular idols, but he set up in their place one whom, almost by instinct, Englishmen distrusted, and for whose downfall

---

procession, which would equally take place, the Pontiff would be personated by a Cardinal, or other individual, got up in character. When, therefore, the people saw their real Sovereign in his own person they became wildly excited. Long before the Cross-bearer at the head of the procession arrived on the Piazza, we distinguished the shout, "Viva il Papa Re." The scene was strikingly impressive and beautiful—full of life, movement, and colour: tapestry hanging from the houses, devices of varied design, groups with flowers at every window. At last there was startling transition from comparative tranquillity to enthusiastic animation. The Pope appeared, and like the full burst of an organ all the stops of popular feeling were drawn out in the loud, joyous roar of the great Roman crowd beneath. There was animated and sparkling movement over the dense excited mass, fluttering of handkerchiefs, waving of flags, showering of flowers, and the long, continuous shout which rose to the dignity of a prayer, "Viva il Papa Re."

Later in the spring the Pope made his annual visit to the ancient Church and Convent of St. Agnes, two miles beyond the gates of Rome. The road was thronged with carriages, and the footway with people, and in the crowds assembled there was a repetition of the enthusiasm of the last-mentioned occasion. At night there was an illumination of the whole city, and its universality proved it the result of popular impulse, and showed unmistakably how general were the sentiments of attachment to the Pope. My long acquaintance with Rome and with the people enables me to appreciate the value and sincerity of these demonstrations. I shall only add that the observations made to me by many of our countrymen and visitors to Rome, men of every variety of creed and opinion, were in perfect accordance with my own.

they were eagerly looking. To them Garibaldi and Mazzini stood for Italian Independence and the freedom of mankind; the Pope stood for slavery and tyranny and the Dark Ages.

Because Urquhart execrated the methods[1] of the Italian Revolution, because he insisted on bare justice for the Pope, he was, in the eyes of the mass of Englishmen, out for Popery, and a foe to liberty and independence.

As a matter of fact, Urquhart was never opposed to Italian Independence *per se;* this is evident in his letter to Daniele Manin in 1848. It was Revolution manufactured from without that he opposed—it was injustice and lawlessness masking themselves under the name "National Union."

"It is not Italy liberated and united against the foreigner, it is a foreign-bred faction usurping the government of Italy by destroying the separate States and relying for support upon foreign intrigue. If Italy had been threatened, as a portion of it was occupied, by foreigners; if Italians had only panted for independence, not lusted for participation in the crimes of Europe, nor listened to the phrases coined by knaves to pass current amongst fools, Italy might have arrived at a union under one Sovereign, but would have retained its local life and independence. But with a Central Parliament, where all manners, rights,

[1] Such as the following description of the working of the Plebiscite in Savoy from Jepp's *Diplomatic Revelations of a Secret Agent of Count Cavour.* London, 1862.

"We had the registers brought to us that we might prepare the list of electors; we made out all the bulletins. For these first local elections, as afterwards for the annexation vote, only few electors presented themselves to take any part; but at the moment of closing up the urns we threw in the bulletins naturally for Piedmont—not, of course, quite all: we left out some hundreds, or some thousands, according to the population represented by the College."

"Before the vote was opened, agents of the police and disguised carbineers choked up all the entrances to the hall, and it was from these impartial persons that the President of the Bureau and the scrutineers were always chosen. We were, therefore, not crippled in that regard. In some Colleges, however, this wholesale introduction into the urn of the bulletins of the absent, which we called 'completing the vote,' was done with so little care that, upon the proclamation of the result, it was found that there had been more votes than electors inscribed."

opinions, laws, shall be settled for all by the calculation of the votes of some, a condition of prostration is established for all in the face of the Executive, out of which must come two apparently different results—revolt against the head, and apathy between the parts."

It was so-called "Legislative Union," not "Italian Unity" that Urquhart resisted—Legislative Union, that is, as opposed to municipal government. In no part of the world, said he, save in Greece and Switzerland, had municipal organisation been more prominent than in the Italian Peninsula. Now, however, "for the control of the municipalities is to be substituted the consent of the Parliament to everything performed by the Cabinet of Turin and designed by that of St. Petersburg."

For in St. Petersburg Urquhart had always seen the great foe to municipal government; everywhere, he said, her one aim had been its suppression.

In the Papacy he had, on the other hand, always seen the great bar to Russian diplomacy. He had said to Cardinal Capaccini in 1844: "Rome can be saved from Russia only if there is an honest Minister in Sardinia." He had seen in the entry of Sardinia into the Crimean War the first direct move on the part of Russia against the Papacy. He had protested against the interference with Italian affairs by the Congress of Paris. And now, that by his words spoken so long ago, he had again proved himself a true prophet, he declared his high hopes for the future of Italy in one sentence spoken to a Sardinian statesman: "The Pope is the only real thing in Italy. You, as a Catholic and an Italian, do not see this. If you are to have an Italian Unity, it can only be done by making the Pope King of Italy."

This was Gioberti's dream, the vision of a Confederate Italy under the Pope, finding expression through an Englishman and a Protestant. To him Rome, the capital of Italy, was as much the degradation of a great idea as Cavour's famous "Free Church in a Free State." "Rome was never the capital of Italy," he said; "when Italy was governed from Rome, Rome governed the world."

And though Urquhart was never a Catholic, this was *his* dream—impossible of fulfilment as it proved—for the future of Italy.[1]

[1] It was not in Italy alone that Urquhart fought "Legislative Union."

In 1847, he wrote a long letter to his ardent friend and supporter, Sir George Sinclair, on the subject of the Repeal of the Union between England and Ireland.

The letter is too long to quote in full; it is to be found in the *Diplomatic Review* of December 5, 1866. Anyone who is sufficiently interested to read it will find little in it which might not have been written to-day.

In the course of the letter Urquhart says:

"Now let us drop the case of right. Let us assume it. Is it expedient to stand upon it and deny the wishes of Ireland?

"Immediately arise a host of questions. Have results at home proved your faculty to legislate well? Has success in Ireland crowned your past experiments? Have you obtained material benefits from her, equivalent to her resources? Have you acquired her goodwill and affection as the fruits of your justice, wisdom, and moderation? Do you acquit yourself in the management of her affairs with self-satisfaction and ease? If the answers are in the affirmative, the question of the expediency of entertaining Ireland's request is opened, not closed; but if, on all or any, the answer is in the negative, then I think the question of expediency settles into its admission.

"You have oppressed Ireland, and you have alienated her. The one is not your interest nor the other your purpose. She has, therefore, been the occasion to you of a great delusion. The alienation is the result of oppression. The oppression has been for gain's sake, not gain of the English nation, but of some of its servants: you have been deluded to screen their acts.

"In former times the Court was the acting hand. Now it is the Parliament. The delusion has thus extended from the misrepresentation of particular incidents to the falsification of general principles. How dangerous, then, is Ireland to England! Well might we wish that the Atlantic rolled between.

"But it may be asked, 'How can we get rid of her? We cannot sink her nor transport her. There she is. We have extinguished her means of government; we must go on governing her; embarrassing as she is, she might become more so if we relinquished our hold.' He would be a bold man to say that she could have managed herself worse than we have managed her. Had she done so, still would it not have been our act; then would her eyes, and hope, and heart, have been turned towards England for refuge, remedy, and redress. Left to herself, she must either have been better or as bad. If better, we would have derived the benefit; if as bad, she would not, at least, have domineered over us. . . . Satisfied that the nationality of Ireland could not be destroyed, and, under the purifying process of oppression, would revive, I have long looked to her, as, I may almost say, the only hope I had for England. Suffering at England's hands, I expected she would, in time, repudiate her modern doctrines. I waited to visit her until that hope should be confirmed. For the

first time I met fellow-countrymen whom I was not ashamed to avow as such; for the first time I found fellow-labourers. They could be made to see that freedom did not reside in Parliamentary omnipotence, and that the rights of freedom did not consist in the electoral franchise. I can compare the effect upon me, only to escaping out of a damp mist into the open air to breathe and see. In regard to England, they did labour under misconceptions which nurtured intense hate. I had, therefore, to require from them justice to England. The proposition might excite surprise, but nothing could be more satisfactory than the discovery of their mistake; for it was nothing less than the discovery that England was not against them, but only the House of Commons, and that House only when doing things for which it was not sent, and to do which it had no power. They thus saw that it was to England that they had to look and trust for help, against a system which betrayed the one country to oppress the other. Then could they justly say, ' Our independence concerns the maintenance of the British Empire and the peace of Europe.' "

CHAPTER XI

URQUHART IN SAVOY

"That's the appropriate country; there men's thought,
Rarer, intenser,
Self-gathered for an outbreak, as it ought,
Chafes in the Censer."

URQUHART'S connection with the various political movements of his time lies outside the scope of the present work. In them all, from the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny to the Italian War of Liberation, his point of view was emphatically not that of the majority of his contemporaries. As regards the last, it was more Catholic than that of many Catholics.

This was not wholly due to Urquhart's reverence for the great past of the Papacy, though he was intensely conscious of the part it had played in European history, nor to the influence of his Catholic friends; it was the result of a conviction, which, it seemed to him, had always been the working principle of Catholic statecraft, that the only possible basis of political action was religion and morality—a conviction which appears very clearly in his association with those foreign Catholics amongst whom, in the latter years of his life, were to be found his closest associates and friends.

He left England in 1864, suffering from a complete breakdown in health, and for the rest of his life made his summer home in a châlet which he had designed and built for himself high up on the mountains of Savoy, above St. Gervais.

The Châlet des Mélèzes became a Mecca to those for whom Urquhart was a prophet. English statesmen, French bishops, Turkish functionaries high in the Ottoman Government, visited him there, not to tell, but to learn, what had happened in Europe. There he rested his tired brain by

making his garden, though it was at an altitude where he had been warned that nothing would grow, the admiration of all who survived the two hours' precipitous ascent from the village of St. Gervais.[1] He was delighted when the warnings proved wrong. No one had ever seen such roses as made the châlet, during the short summer months, a dream of colour; while the large and luscious strawberries were not only his pride, but the wonder of all the peasants of the mountain-side. His garden was, as indeed were all material things, a symbol to him.

"I regret that you did not come yesterday," he writes, "for I should have presented you with a rose as an answer to the letter which you did me the honour to write to me. It was the most beautiful rose I had ever seen. When, at this elevation of two thousand metres, I put spade into the ground, everyone ridiculed me. Well, I have not only had crops, but the crops have surpassed those of the plains. My potatoes have satisfied the hunger of my neighbours below, when theirs have been a failure. The rose I speak of would have said, 'A thing is not true because people believe it, nor impossible because they say it is.' I should have added, by way of commentary, 'That which a modern European believes is probably false, and that which he calls impossible is a thing to be attempted and accomplished by an upright heart.'"

Though Urquhart was in an extraordinary degree beyond the influence of other minds, his residence in Savoy is marked by the exhibition of a phase of his character unknown to most of his intimates. He found himself for the first time in his life in the society of men who had arrived at his own moral standpoint, though by different paths; for the first time he felt himself in the presence of those

[1] The children brought up in the châlet, and as much at home on the mountains as young goats, used to watch with wicked glee the toil-worn and perspiring appearance of portly bishops and high-heeled French ladies as they emerged from the pine-woods below the châlet, on a visit to their father.

There is a story told in the family that, after such a visit, a friend, encountering an ecclesiastic in the village of St. Gervais, exclaimed with uplifted hands: "Mais, Monsieur l'Abbé, quel air souffrant! Vous êtes, done, bien malade?" "Non," replied the other with a meek air of resignation. "J'ai visité M. Urquhart."

THE CHALET DES MÉLÈZES
in 1900

who had something to teach him, before whom he had best keep silence. "It is curious that I have conversed with three priests," he says in a letter to a friend shortly after his arrival, "since I left England, to whom I had nothing to say, and from whom I had everything to learn."

He had known and reverenced the great past of the Catholic Church, but he had thought of it as past; when he came to live amongst Catholics, he was brought for the first time since his boyhood into contact with her pulsating inner life, her vital thought, now in a social reformer of world-wide fame like M. Le Play, now in the great Oratorian, Père Gratry, now in the Bishops of Orleans and Geneva, now in a simple village priest of the Argonne. With all these he found himself in a deep and tranquil agreement, to which his stormy life had been a stranger, on those things which were to him the basis of all Religion, Justice and Law.[1]

"Je viens de parcourir," he wrote to Baron d'Yvoire, "*Les Sources* du Père Gratry. J'y trouve précisément ce que je voulais dire."

It was his friendship with such men as these which gave a new direction to Urquhart's efforts after the re-establishment of the principles of International Law. He had always maintained that at the root of national peace and prosperity was the Law of Nations. He had set his Foreign Affairs Committees to study Vattel, and he pointed out without ceasing the steady decline of the idea of International Justice since the last great writer on the Law of Nations had published his *Droit des Gens* in 1758.

The admiring interest with which he had studied mediæval institutions, as well as his intercourse with his eccentric and gifted friend, Thomas Anstey, had taught him to look beyond Grotius to the source whence Grotius derived his knowledge. That source he rightly discerned to be the

[1] "Je suis frappé," writes M. Le Play, "plus que jamais, de la complète conformité de vues qui règne entre M. Urquhart et moi touchant le principe des rapports internationaux. Comme lui, je suis convaincu que l'Europe est perdue si en cette matière on ne reste pas purement et simplement dans les prescriptions du Christianisme."

Catholic Church. But during the earlier part of his life his mind was evidently somewhat vague as to how the Church had expressed herself on points of international morality. He probably thought, and in a measure rightly thought, that each case on its merits formed part of the moral teaching given by the living voice of the Church in each age. It was not until he got into touch with the larger Catholic world, that he realised the existence of the Canon Law, its connection with the Roman Law, the object of his greatest admiration, and its place in the economy of the Church.

Side by side with this discovery of the existence of the Canon Law he made another discovery, which the great mass of Catholics themselves have not yet made, that the Church has forgotten her great heritage. Even out of her catechisms has slipped the clear, definite, unmistakable teaching of the Law between nations. "Let her once more set it forth," he said, "and the Church will save, not only the Papal States, but the whole of Europe, which is perishing under a reign of lawlessness."

In the attack on the Temporal Power of the Pope the prevailing lawlessness had, he believed, culminated.

On the rare occasions in modern history when the Popes had interfered in European statecraft, Urquhart saw them guiding their conduct by a Law as much beyond the moral vision of the modern diplomatist as was the Mussulman code beyond the comprehension of Christian teachers who could applaud the Chinese War. Small wonder, then, that he desired that not only Canonists, but every human being, Catholic and Protestant alike, should be made acquainted with that Law whose very existence was forgotten by the mass of men.

It was very natural that they should be oblivious of it. Written in a learned language, it was the law of no Court which counted any longer in the world; it was enforced by no recognised authority. When men thought of the Canon Law, they thought of a set of rules framed by priests and Popes for the guidance of ecclesiastical bodies and religious people, not of laws founded on the Code of Justinian—

many of them of universal application. To Englishmen it was reminiscent of nothing but ecclesiastical tyranny and the Dark Ages, before "the glorious light of the Reformation" had dawned upon the lands.

To Urquhart the discovery of the Canon Law was so great a discovery that the rest of his life is a history of attempts to bring it to the knowledge of men, and to procure its restatement, so sure was he that in it was contained exactly that moral force which would regenerate the world.

The Canon Law, even had it done nothing else, emphasised the application to nations and communities of those same laws which men recognised in their relation to one another. "Therefore," said Urquhart, "the Canon Law must be restored."

But how? His little company of friends had various schemes to propose. Two French priests proposed the foundation of a Society—the *Œuvre Apostolique*—which should have branches in all countries, and whose object should be to promote the knowledge of the Law amongst Catholics. A French barrister, M. Juvigny, wrote a book on the restoration of the Canon Law, which was to be published in England. Various towns like Rheims, Grenoble and Arras, famous for the study of Law, took up Urquhart and his ideas enthusiastically. The Bishop of Geneva's secretary suggested that modern catechisms, out of which had dropped any teaching on Law between nations, should be revised and the teaching of the older catechisms restored. Those who were still carrying on in England the Foreign Affairs Committees met with an enthusiastic response to their attempts to set forth amongst the working men the ancient Canon Law.

A very clear indication of the intellectual development reached by the members of the Committees is afforded by their quick response to ideas so entirely new to them.

Obviously, however, the mass of men would be untouched by these methods. The *Œuvre Apostolique* would appeal to the devout; works of Jurisprudence to lawyers; the English Working Men's Associations could only move slowly, learning as they went.

What the world needed was a voice which could reach to her utmost bounds.

In 1866 the Pope declared to the Bishops, assembled in Rome to keep the centenary of St. Peter, his intention of holding an Œcumenical Council. "The Council is necessary," he said, "to put in order the affairs of the world, which is crumbling into dust, because it has forgotten the Divine Law which is the foundation of human society."

This was the voice for which the world was waiting!

Pius IX. was now an old man. It was twenty years since the unrest of Italy, culminating in the revolt of Rome, had driven him to exile at Gaëta. During those years, though Rome was for the present under the insecure protection of France, he had watched all the mingled farrago of enthusiasm, ambition, idealism and corruption work itself out into the concrete reality of the new Kingdom of Italy. He had seen the old standards, the old sanctions, the old reverences falling one by one; he stood now the leader of a small forlorn hope, facing an army that was daily being strengthened by deserters from his own ranks, who declared that old things, amongst which was Religion, had passed away for ever, all things had become new; that in the great days that were coming they would have Liberty for Authority, the Rights of Man in exchange for the Moral Law.

The days were gone, they said, when the sons of the Kings who had oppressed the Church should come kneeling before her; when Kings and Queens should serve her. It was now for the Church to serve the State, the greatest thing in the world, beyond all law and all authority.

Pius IX.'s answer was to publish the Syllabus and to call a General Council.

No General Council had been held since the Council of Trent, and the powers of the world did not know whether to be alarmed that the Church, which they had thought was dying, had come to life again, as she had so often done in days of old, or to be angered that the Head of the Church presumed to summon to his side their subjects over whom they, but just now, had been busy asserting their supreme rights.

Their alarm and anger were not allayed when it was known that the Council proposed to declare the Dogma of the Papal Infallibility, and the feeling which had been aroused by the Syllabus with its so-called reactionary tone and its strong denunciation of well-established public opinion was increased sevenfold. France was excited; the French Assembly discussed whether the State should not interfere to prevent the bishops obeying the summons. Diplomatists buzzed like flies about the Pope, who preserved a complete calm.

France, said her Ambassador, would withdraw her troops.

"Elle peut les retirer," said the Pope.

M. Beust was opposed to any reference to civil government.

"M. Beust passera, les Canons resteront," said the Pope.

But to David Urquhart it seemed as though the sun was rising once more over the world.

Now there was hope that they might return—those great days when there was public Law in Europe; the days when the Chair of Peter was the Seat of Law; when in every land Doctors of the Church lifted up their voices to proclaim that Law; when, "to the castles of the Great, to the homes of the Lowly," went from university and monastery, bishops and priests armed with an authority teaching one Law; when Rome had a definite policy which all men knew, a policy which, in spite of lapses, made for right; when gentle and simple alike thronged the universities, which were the schools of Law; when, though men and nations might disobey and set at defiance the Law, they, at least, had not lost this mark of humanity—that they knew it. Those were the days when the Popes, the Grand Justiciars of Europe, were not afraid to defend the weak against the strong; when it was the proudest boast of the greatest amongst them: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."

All this Urquhart saw when he looked back over the Middle Ages, and though he looked with the eyes of one who loved them, it was not the less a true picture which he saw.

The Middle Ages were the Ages of Law, and it was the Reign of Law that he longed to bring back, in which he saw the only hope for the world.

The conviction eame upon him now, in all its completeness, that only through the Church could that reign return. "The Church of Rome," he said, "was in spirit, as she is now in form, judicial." Her very faults were those of a judieial body; the rigidity of which men complained, her close adherence to form, her insistence on legal precedence. These things, in all his relations with her, never estranged Urquhart. His own judicial mind understood the neeessity for them.

The Syllabus, in the eyes of nearly the whole of Europe reactionary and ridiculous, when it was not dangerous, expressed what Urquhart had been saying all his life.

He, too, believed that the true motives of action, justice and human right had been lost, and that material force had taken their place. He, too, had been all his life pointing out, at last with the scorn of hopelessness, the certain ruin whieh would follow if public opinion were taken as the guide of life, instead of Divine and human right.

"A Society set free from the laws of religion and true justice," said the Pope, "ean have no other object than the accumulation of wealth, and no other law in all its acts than the eager desire to satisfy the passions and to procure enjoyment."

Urquhart had been preaehing for more than twenty years that all social evils had come from the overthrow of Law.

The intense signifieance of the Syllabus lay, for him, rather in what it was not than in what it was. It was a document of "no political importance, save the use which would be made of it" to destroy the Papal power in Italy; of no originality, for it said what had been said better many times before. In fact, it was of no mark at all save that it showed that the world would have been without an anchor but for one man, who understood the trend of events, and who could expose the idle forms of speech which concealed the most dangerous errors of the day.

It was this exposure rather than the denunciations it contained which Urquhart held to be valuable. Had he not preached for years that all language was falsified, and that therefore there was no vehicle in popular language for wholesome and pure ideas, but only for vague and erroneous opinions.

Thus Rome became at once his great hope for the future. He saw the vision of what might be the result of strong and effective action, such as that of some of the mediæval Popes, in a world which he, almost alone of his contemporaries, knew to be in a desperate condition; we ourselves know now how desperate. For one who sees with the eyes of the mind sees, as it were, with telescopic sight. What is far off is brought near, and to him details stand out which to the ordinary onlooker do not exist.

To his contemporaries, to the greater part of those who read Urquhart's letters to the press, while indeed the press continued to publish his letters, or heard the speeches of his later years, he seemed exaggerated to the point of eccentricity, not to say madness.

Of his constantly reiterated warning, this was, in effect, the substance:—

For all the apparent security in which men had wrapped themselves, the civilisation, nay, the very life of Europe was at stake. The nations were rushing towards a cataclysm the like of which had never yet been seen. The apparent law, order, and decency of government and social state was nothing but a show. Governments were watching to fly at each other's throats, and so were the different classes of society. It was only fear and expediency which held them back. Law was entirely set aside in international relations, it would soon cease to be considered in the internal affairs of nations.

Truth had ceased to be part of the equipment of diplomatists; it had ceased to exist in the communications of governments to their people. The newspapers did not exist to communicate facts, but to spread lies, to make the people believe what successive Governments wished them to believe.

In this way, even by a Government like that of England, which called itself democratic, all power and responsibility was taken out of the hands of the people.

But not only did the Governments hide truth from the people, they were themselves blind to it. What European Governments had seen the meaning of the German Zollverein ? Who had believed him when he pointed out the safety as well as the justice of safeguarding the independence of the Duchies ? How he had been laughed to scorn when he pointed out the danger, to say nothing of the crime, of conniving at the slaughter of Poland and the fall of Circassia !

Greater than all dangers loomed the danger of Russia. Incomprehensible to the mass of Englishmen, a stranger from the East, whose guile was more dangerous than her force, great as that might be; whose cruelty was beyond the imagination of Europeans; who had not cast aside Law, for she had never possessed it; whose religion under her veneer of Christianity was still barbarism, regarded only by her rulers as a means of extending their power; a great monstrous shadow, rising out of the East, ever creeping on over civilisation, blighting all on which she rested, whose greed for land was insatiable, and whose only mistress, desire. Utterly regardless of human life, she fermented revolution for her own ends. Her agents were spread abroad throughout Europe and the East, she gloated over anarchy, disorder, and unrest, and there was not a disturbance or rising in Europe at which she had not been present, leading it on to greater and greater excesses by her whispers and suggestions, or by her open preaching of revolt. In the Cabinets of Europe it had ever been her mission to oppose law and order and justice, to suggest and induce the disregard of law, to foster the deceit and disorder by which she throve. She would not rest, her work would not be done, till the capitals of Europe were heaped-up ruins. Her great strength lay in this, that men did not realise either her aims or in what her power lay.[1]

[1] See Fallmerayer in *Geschichte des Kaiserthums von Trapezunt*, Munich. 1827.

It requires no prophetic vision to see in the fruit what Urquhart saw in the flower.

The masses are to-day swayed by public opinion, and public opinion is carefully guarded by a press, not only censored but bought. The papers are published not to tell truth but to conceal it. A prominent journalist of the time has described the press as a machine daily plunging the people into darkness to bring out a purpose.[1]

Meanwhile, though the War is over, we are faced with two great dangers. The first is neo-Prussianism. The spirit of the Zollverein, though hard hit, is not yet dead. We are welding the German peoples together by the very severity of the Peace terms as they have never been welded before.

The second danger is greater because more unknown. What menace to Europe lies hid in that land of mystery, which, always unknown, has, in these days of telegraph, telephone, and wireless, withdrawn itself behind a thick veil of darkness ?

"Every nation," said Urquhart, "has in the main the government it deserves." What, then, is the real character of the Russian nation ? Did its duplicity belong entirely to the Czar and his entourage, and are its greed and cruelty buried for ever in the ruins of the old dynasty, or do they still penetrate European countries, a plague and a menace [2] as they did in the days when the hapless Alexis, so like in character and destiny to the last of the Romanoff Emperors, was tortured and done to death, not by his people, but by his father ?

From the dangers which, to his prophetic eye, threatened to engulf Europe Urquhart saw one way of escape, and only one—the revival of Law.

Law, to him, was that by which human beings could weigh their actions and measure their words. It was the earthly manifestation of Divine Justice. It was that without which this ordered Universe would fall into chaos. For

[1] *British Review*, December, 1913.

[2] See an article by Ikbar Ali Shah in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1919, on the Russian menace.

the restoration of Law Urquhart had all his life been struggling, by voice and by pen, finding but one here and there who could understand the language he spoke.

"Voilà mon état," he writes to the Bishop of Rodez in 1869, "c'est le monde qui se laisse tuer et qui aide à se faire tuer devant mes yeux et ce n'est pas la voix qui m'est coupée, mais c'est que mes paroles sont incompréhensibles pour ses habitants."

Urquhart was in this state of despair over the condition of the world when the Pope declared to the assembled bishops his intention of holding a General Council of the Catholic Church.

He was not the only social reformer to whom this news came as a ray of hope. "Je viens de découvrir avec bonheur, un nouveau point de contacte entre M. Urquhart et moi," writes M. Le Play, "en ce qui concerne la régénération de l'Europe par l'influence bienfaisante directe ou indirecte des conciles œcuméniques. . . . Il y a une influence bienfaisante qui s'exercera plus utilement encore au profit de la religion et de l'humanité, quand l'Église universelle reprenant sa tradition, la plus ancienne, sera de nouveau représentée par des conciles réguliers."

Urquhart was even more enthusiastic than Le Play. Here was the Head of the only Body in the world which had never let go her hold on the Law, who himself knew the ruin which threatened to follow the arrogance of the modern theory of the State, the lawlessness of all classes of society, proposing to hold a Council to avert that ruin. How else could he propose to do it, except by setting forth the Divine Law, that the nations might see how far they had departed from it?

The occasion was unique, the possibilities infinite. The Pope, a temporal sovereign, but unbound by the diplomatic fetters of other rulers, would, from his capital, which was also the capital of Christendom, proclaim the Law. The blind eyes of the nations would be opened. They would see for the first time their danger and their safety: their danger in their own carelessness of right, and their tolerance of acts of lawlessness and international crime; their safety

in an open, universal return to the obedience of the Law. East and West would unite in the reign of Law.

Out of the spiritual and moral regeneration of Europe would come peace and brotherhood, an end of war and hatred. Europe would be free from the menace that had hung over her so long, for in the wake of the Council would follow organisations: National Courts, where each nation would decide the issues of peace and war on the ground of justice alone; a great College for the study and codification of Law, for the training of men to think internationally, a school through which the affairs of Europe would pass, so that her councils could no longer be swayed now by one great Power, now by another, anxious only each one for her own self-aggrandisement.

The baseless fabric of a vision ! The vision of a Utopia, one of those cloudland cities towards which dreamers in all ages of the world's history have stretched forth weary arms and strained aching eyes !

But there is no dream without a reality somewhere. And every true dream of a noble dreamer brings the reality nearer.

Already rose-tinted fragments of Urquhart's Dream City are floating about the world.

His cloudland City of Law may have remained in the clouds, but since he pointed it out men have seen constant visions of it; our dark and lowering sky reflects stray fragments of it.

And as men, when they see in the sky strange and wonderful mirages of cities and ships, know that, though they behold a vision, the reality is there, so it is with us. The vision is a vision, but it is a true picture of a reality which exists somewhere.

The world of ideas is as real as the world of facts; nay, more real: it is to ideas that facts owe their birth.

CHAPTER XII

URQUHART'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

> "Heaven, which man's generations draws,
> Nor deviates into replicas,
> Must of as deep diversity
> In judgment as creation be."
>
> FRANCIS THOMPSON: *A Judgment in Heaven.*

AT the risk of repetition it seems well, at this point, to attempt some explanation of Urquhart's personal attitude towards the Church of Rome, which, in spite of his great sympathy with her social and political standpoints, and his reverence for many of her representatives, remained to the end of his public life substantially what it was at the beginning.

It is an impossible task, often as it has been attempted, to make any hard-and-fast rules as to the class of mind on which the Catholic Church is likely to exercise her attraction.

Many of those who, by every rule of psychology, ought to have fallen under her power remain untouched, while the most unlikely yield to it.

Urquhart neither resisted her nor wholly yielded.

It might have been argued that a man to whose nature freedom and independence of thought were the breath of life, who was constantly at variance with things as they were, who was a sworn foe to convention, to a sheep-like following of accepted theories or opinions, who laid on his private judgment all the burden of his right living and thinking, would naturally have been the last to be attracted to a religious institution which, by common repute, was inimical to liberty either of thought or of action, which insisted on a slavish following of rules, maxims, accepted

beliefs and theories, which held men's consciences bound under sin to follow not only the commandments of God, but the dicta of men, and finally insisted that all private judgment should be surrendered, on demand and irrevocably, to its asserted authority. Or, on the other hand, if he did admit her claims, it would never be with the intellect, it could only be under the stress of such great and overwhelming spiritual emotion as would demand the supreme sacrifice of his whole being, of action, thought, judgment and will, so that whatever might be his attitude towards the rest of the world, it would henceforth be towards the Catholic Church one of absolute submission.

Neither of these alternative modes of action, however, was Urquhart's; he adopted instead a course which even to a student of his character, must appear, at first sight, surprising.

On the one hand he was full of admiration for the Catholic Church: she was for him the only moral force in Europe. Her Head had alone of European Sovereigns commanded the respect of and even put the fear of God into Napoleon.[1]

In 1842 Gregory XVI., "with a solitary regiment of Guards, had dared to do what France, England and Prussia, with a million and a quarter bayonets at their disposal, had feared to do — tax the Emperor of Russia with a lie!"

Urquhart hailed with joy the remonstrance which the Pope had addressed to the Czar on his breach of the Treaty of Vienna in the persecutions of both Russian and Polish Catholics. His imagination was touched by the spectacle of the Pontiff, powerless and despised, yet alone in Europe venturing to call to account for his deeds the Czar of all the Russias.

He recalled the great past of the Church—great not in wealth and power, but in the righteousness and justice in which to-day she might be great also:

"In the early days, the Bishops of Rome supplicated to the strong and interceded for the weak. And they denounced where they could not prevent. Through their thousands of priests and monks they laboured in the remote

boroughs, through their prelates and nuncios in princely halls, to impress respect for law, charity to men. They taught the young, counselled the powerful, protected the weak, and thus by patient, resigned and zealous devotion to the task of teaching, they themselves became leaders, chiefs and princes. This power was gained by their setting their faces against oppression, and as this was separately done in each State of Christendom, the Church simultaneously rose to the control of International Relations. Thus did Religion put a check upon the passions of Nation against Nation, and on the power of Prince against Prince. . . . (To-day) the Pope finds Europe exposed, not severally to the feudal oppression of King and Baron, but to a danger that menaces it altogether. He warns Europe; he must go on to call forth all the mental powers possessed by his See, and they are tremendous, whensoever employed, to resist the common enemy by awakening all other States to a sense of their danger, and by recalling to the hearts of men a sense of Justice, without which that danger cannot be averted. All other Powers having abandoned this defence he stands forth alone as the Defender of Europe. It is a mightier task than that of his predecessors—than that by the accomplishment of which his predecessors raised the Popedom to the highest level of earthly dignity and spiritual preponderance over the Western World."

The Papacy was to Urquhart the earthly representative of the Divine Justice. She was the one Power out of all the world which could stand against the evil incarnate of autocracy, aggression and oppression. She was the source of Law and the Law-giver to Europe. She was the Guardian of the Tradition, which is the safeguard of Doctrine. Her power depended not on circumstances, but on her empire over the hearts and consciences of men.

The Popes, in the past, had been guilty of pride and arrogance, and, in the present, the fear of man, timidity and vacillation had ruled their counsels; but if the saying "By their fruits ye shall know them" had any meaning at all, then he, and those like-minded with him, were right in regarding the Papacy as the one steady light amid darkness, the one hope for the safety of Europe; for amid all her failures she had never failed through long centuries to

hold up to the Nations the Commandments of God for their entire and unswerving obedience.

It is perhaps the most irrefutable proof of the justice of the Church's claim to spiritual empire that each man discovers in her the fulfilment of the needs of his own nature.

Urquhart found in her the fount and guardian of Law; and in the Pope he found the Law-giver. In the Papal Infallibility he firmly believed, even before the promulgation of the Decree, though perhaps his explanation of it would not have generally commended itself to Catholics.

It followed in his mind as a natural corollary to his belief in the power of individual man to be right, that there must be an organisation in the world, an authority which was consciously able not to err. That organisation, that authority, he found in the Catholic Church.

If the Church was able to be right, so must also its head and voice. "To deny it," he said, "makes the body a corpse; it is like the head of John the Baptist in a charger."

It was, in fact, the Pope on whom Urquhart's eyes were fixed when he spoke of the Church. To him the Pope was not only the great authority and teacher. He was the ideal Sovereign beneath whose rule, founded as it was on absolute justice, the peoples might have dwelt in freedom and security alike from the twin-tyrannies of force and legislation. Such he had been, in theory at least, in the Middle Ages, such he might be now in an even truer sense if he would but stand firm against the Anti-Christ,[1] which had overshadowed Europe and over which he alone on earth had power.

When Urquhart was apprised by an Oxford friend that there were those who were startled, and even shocked, at finding a tendency, if not to a union with the Church of Rome, at least to a great admiration for her doctrines and practice, he answered that in dealing with religion he looked "to the obligations it imposes, not to the Creed it professes, and it was in that respect that he placed the

[1] To him the Anti-Christ was any power which did not acknowledge Law; it was, he believed, incarnate in his times in Russia.

Church of Rome far above any Protestant body." "The former had," he said, "preserved traditions of better times, and had not propounded that monstrous doctrine which extinguishes the citizen and the Christian: 'Religion and politics are distinct.'"[1]

On the other hand, for all his admiration, Urquhart's attitude towards the Catholic Church was never that of submission; his veneration for the great past of the Papacy went along with a clear view of what he considered to be her faults, and an unsparing denunciation of them.

In the hey-dey of her power as a temporal Sovereignty,

[1] That the respect between Urquhart and the Catholic Church was mutual can be seen in a Review on his Treatise "The Duty of the Church of England in regard to Unlawful War" which appeared in the *Catholic Magazine* for July, 1843. In the course of his remarks the reviewer says: "This is a welcome monograph from the pen of an eminent diplomatist of this country, whose valuable contributions to our store of knowledge upon the policy of Russia—more especially as regards our possessions in the East—give him a standing title to the public attention, whenever he may choose to claim it.

"The inferiority of British diplomatists is the laughing-stock of the whole of the diplomatic world. If the Russians have over-reached and ridiculed us in every negotiation from the Treaty of Vienna downwards, we have only ourselves to thank for it. . . .

"Mr. Urquhart, being of too high a mind to engage in diplomacy upon the customary terms of knowing nothing about it, began public life by making himself master of his subject. This achievement, superadded to a stock of principle and patriotic ardour, altogether irregular and unofficial, very soon insured him the open hostility of his already jealous associates. Downing Street and he parted company, and returned, the former to its wallowing in the mire, the latter to the prosecution of his generous and far-reaching plans for the salvation of an empire jeopardised by the apathy of the nation and its blind confidence in weak or traitorous servants. The first of the treatises named at the head of our own article endeavours to set in motion an old Catholic principle, which from the Reformation downwards had gradually subsided into inert and deathlike repose. It seeks to revive amongst Protestants a doctrine that has almost been forgotten in practice among ourselves. In unfavourable days, and to an unbelieving and evil generation, he presents again the true principle that was paramount in the days when Christendom was great. In a land which resounds with the parrot-like repetitions of the same trite phrase, importing a heresy in one of its acceptations, and a silly truism in the other that 'the Church has nothing to do with politics,' this Protestant and diplomatist has not hesitated to avow that it is at all times the duty of the Church of God to make clear what is doubtful in public as well as in private affairs, and that unless it denounces the crime of which the public or the State is guilty or about to become so, its sanction is tacitly given to the wickedness which it has not exerted itself to resist."

though she had been free from territorial ambition and had never been guilty of oppression of the poor, she had been lordly and domineering over her equals.

For the Reformation which was fraught with such dire consequences to the whole of Europe, she was herself largely responsible by her failure to see and reform her own abuses. And though, after that cataclysm, she had been the first to recover herself, and had nobly re-established Public Law in her place of honour before the Nations of Europe, it was her failure to live up to that law, to maintain it against the powers of the world, which had involved the world in lawlessness.

Though the Pope had saved his own soul by refusing to take any part in the Holy Alliance, he had failed to rule his own household, and in the eyes of Europe he had been himself incriminated by the part which the Apostolic Emperor played at that Congress. His own moral force was weakened when, instead of upholding Poland in her resistance to injustice, he had, by his Rescript enjoining on her obedience to Russia, weakly surrendered Right to Might.

When the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed in England, no lead was given to Catholics as to the part they ought to play in the nation of which they were once more the potential legislators. The whole modern history of Europe must have been different if English and Irish Catholics, instead of being allowed to drift into traditional party factions, had entered Parliament with some of the spirit of their mediæval predecessors, and had banded themselves together for the defence of Europe.

Writing to an Irish Catholic Archbishop in 1840, Urquhart remonstrated as follows with the policy which the Catholic Hierarchy were pursuing:

"But, my Lord, I do say that much more laudable it had been for the votes of Catholic Ireland to have been registered on the side of Law and Justice. The strength which placed Downing Street at their mercy would have warded off many a blow from the Empire and its foreign Allies and well-wishers; had the Irish members known how

to keep themselves from faction, Poland would have been free, Circassia would have been at peace. The Ottoman Empire would have been independent. The Peninsula would have been enjoying the blessings of a restored, instead of the curses of a fabricated, Constitution. Austria would have remained what she was, England's bulwark against Russia. China would not have known England, save as her distant and friendly customer. Afghanistan would not have been laid waste, its cities burned, its children slaughtered. . . . The Church, my Lord, was ever the authority between Nation and Nation, King and People, citizen and citizen. The whole field of political science is but an acre in the vast domain of duty. You, my Lord, are one of the tillers of the soil. It is the proper scene of your labours, for it is also your inheritance."

There is little doubt that had the Catholic Church of those days preserved the tradition of the time when men knew her for the organised Kingdom of Good, ruling earthly kingdoms, and contending against the Kingdom of Evil, Urquhart would have thrown in his lot whole-heartedly with her. He loved her present form because it seemed to him instinct with her ancient spirit.

"The Church of Rome," he says, "is in form, and was in spirit, more of a legal than a religious body. How else could her jurisdiction have extended beyond the diocese. The Fathers, the writers on Canon Law, the moralists were all lawyers, making the Law, executing the Law, teaching it to boys, enjoining it on Kings."

These words contain the kernel of Urquhart's attraction to the Mediæval Church. It was the home of Law; and Law was to him the earthly expression of the Divine Justice. In her great organisation each kingdom, each diocese, each parish, down to the smallest hamlet of the most remote province had its own Court, its own Tribunal, its own Judge. The Mediæval Church established and maintained, not only the Divine Law against spiritual evil, but she maintained against the feudalism of the Middle Ages an ordered freedom, a reign of Law; in the midst of tyranny she was the champion of the Rights of Man: the only true Democratic Institution then in the world. Here was the true

bond of union between Urquhart and the Church. In his love of Justice his soul reached down to a depth where it was at one with the deep soul of the Church, that eternal and universal part of her which is affected neither by time nor place, and takes no colour, as in her outward structure she is bound to do, from the age through which she passes. She was imperfect, though he felt her to be the most perfect religious system of which he knew, and the spiritual home he failed to find in her he found nowhere else.

He had outworn Calvinism in his youth, and though for many years he had nominally belonged to the Church of England, there was scarcely anything in her past history, in her discipline, in her conduct with regard to international affairs, or in the public actions and utterances of her ministers, from the Archbishop of Canterbury downwards, to which he could give whole-hearted adherence. Her acquiescence in the oppression of the poor and in the abuses of the Poor Law; her attitude towards the wrongs and injustices done to Ireland; her failure to protest against wars of injustice and dishonour, drew from him constant and stern protests.[1] The subversion of the clergy to the State had many times forced him to leave some church in the midst of the clergyman's discourse rather than appear to approve it by remaining. But he reached the high-water-mark of his indignation when the Bishop of Oxford condoned, at a public meeting, the iniquitous peace with China in 1859, by proclaiming that through it "God had opened the door for the Gospel in China."

[1] "The Church of England, having assimilated itself to the Church of Russia, first sanctioned the support of England to such deeds when committed by Russia, and now sanctions them when perpetrated by England herself. . . . To the teachers and preachers of our time, the words 'blood' and 'iniquity' have no meaning. To them the one is 'war' and the other 'policy.' With these they have no concern, and, neglecting the graver matters of the Law, they attend to the mint and cummin; they can be agitated about surplices, convulsed by an epithet, occupied with baptismal fonts and church architecture. They have wrapped themselves round in a cloak of slime, they have embedded their consciences in lees of mud, and neither arguments from without, nor denunciations from within, the Book of God which they handle, or the denunciations of men which they hear, can touch, awake, arouse, or give life." *Portfolio.* New Series. Vol. II. No. 5. "The three Religio-Political Systems of Europe."

He had come across the Oxford Movement to be either entirely untouched by it, or contemptuous of it. "A religion of pews and surplices," he calls it. His intimate friend and parliamentary twin, Thomas Chrisholm Anstey, had passed through it to develop into an ardent Catholic and a keen disciple of Urquhart.

The only other Tractarian with whom he came in close contact was William George Ward.[1] Urquhart in reviewing[2] his famous book, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, is divided between admiration for the writer's enlightenment and surprise at his ignorance. He expresses his astonishment at a remark that it was "for the Church of England to set forth works on International Morality covering more ground than the Roman theologians," since "neither Paley nor the Romans seem to have gone deeply enough into it." "More ground," says the reviewer, "covered, than by Roman works on International Morality! Such words proceeding from a man of the powers of Mr. Ward!"

Urquhart goes on in the same review to describe something of what the Catholic Church had done in the way of setting forth International Morality, and at the same time expresses great hope for Mr. Ward by reason of his apprehension of what most men in his day seem to have forgotten or to be unconscious of—the existence of "National Sin."

[1] There is amongst his papers an account of a visit to Newman at Littlemore in 1844. Newman seems to have been impressed by him, introduced him to Charles Marriott and to W. G. Ward and suggested him calling upon Mozely. "The man on whom my hopes principally at present depend," he writes, "is Mr Ward. This man was quoted on both sides as the man of greatest intellectual power in the University."

Urquhart and Monteith seem to have been engaged at this time in making a missionary tour of Oxford colleges. Monteith expresses himself as delighted with the "quietness, gravity, and indifference to the singularity of facts at first sight" which they found at the University. It reminded him of the operatives' attitude.

"For my part," he says, "I am delighted. Mr. Urquhart has seen, up to this time, some thirty men at University, Merton, Balliol, and Oriel. A Mr. Woolcombe, Tutor at Balliol, brought us and Mr. Ward in contact at breakfast. A conversation from 9 till 11, and now they are out walking, from 2 till 5. This is all very satisfactory.

"We dine in Hall at Merton to-morrow, breakast at University, and there are various other appointments."

[2] *Portfolio*. New Series, No. 12.

The review led to several interviews between Ward and Urquhart, who describes them and their result as follows:

"As for Mr. Ward, no fruits have followed our conversations, though these have been continuous, prolonged, earnest, travelling to past times, remote regions, both for comparison and instruction, and this in reference to our duty, what his, what mine. At the close, the question was what he could effect; the further path lay through the desert; he had to come out from amongst men and enter into himself; and in lieu of all that his present position has of enjoyment in the opinion of men, their hate and reviling, as in corrupt times has been and must be the fate of witnesses against sin. To these thoughts did he seem lifted up, and to this resolution did his lips adhere. Nothing has followed."

However, the following year Ward did go out into the desert, though not in Urquhart's sense. He left his place and work in Oxford and was received into the Catholic Church. Perhaps the discovery which he could not have failed to make during those "continuous and prolonged and earnest conversations," that the Catholic Church *had* apprehended and condemned National Sin, that it would be difficult for him and his friends to find unbroken ground to dig up in the field of National Morality, led him to throw in his lot finally with the great army which for so many centuries had been fighting National Sin and International Immorality by the Public Law, which was the only effective weapon against it.

But neither Ward's example nor Anstey's was one which Urquhart found himself able to follow.

Not all that he knew of the power and virtue of the Church, not all the influence of Catholic friends, not all the admiration and friendship of his later years for many of the eminent Catholics amongst whom his lot was cast, was strong enough to overcome the reasons which he brought forward against such a step. Most of these reasons he attributed to the Church herself, but there are others which we, in looking back on his life, must find in his own character.

He always thought that the Church laid too much stress on the holding of certain doctrines and of faith in them.

To Urquhart conduct was all-important. The Church, he maintained, as she grew more stringent in her demands on a man's faith, had become laxer in regard to his conduct. Particularly this applied to his conduct as member of a Community.

She had, it is true, never dared to take up the doctrine, which certain of the Reformed Churches had adopted at the Reformation, and deny the right of Religion to interfere in Politics, but she had become silent where she used to speak, and had grown complaisant when of old she would have condemned.

Such of her popular devotions too as had come under his notice seemed to him unworthy. All the various devices for overcoming the resistance of the natural man to piety he could neither understand nor sympathise with.

He deprecated the loss of freedom and consequently of individuality, strength and vitality which had resulted from the growing centralisation of her government.

The reasons which Catholics were accustomed to put before him as motives for his conversion were abhorrent to him. The idea of becoming a Catholic to save his own soul was one which he never entertained for a moment. The ultimate end of religion was not a selfish one; it could not be regarded primarily as a means of salvation—that could only be wrought by resistance to evil in others, and sin in oneself.

Nor was it a provision for happiness and peace; it was an oath by which one was bound—in his case bound to labour. The removal of hardness from the path of her children, the fact that she no longer demanded strenuous effort from them, but rather seemed, he thought, to encourage them to inaction, was in his eyes the strongest mark of the modern degeneracy of the Church and enough of itself to bar him from her communion.

On the other hand, there were reasons, equally potent, in Urquhart's own character why he never became a Catholic.

He had not, to begin with, the Catholic conception of Truth. The search after Truth, to him, lay not in any

attempt to arrive at a right apprehension of eternal verities, a true estimate of man's relation to the unseen world, but in sincerity in his actual relations with his fellows.

So also with his theory of perfection. He saw the human imperfections of Catholics. He had his own vision of perfection, to which the Church in her outward manifestations did not correspond. He constantly found himself criticising her. To have thrown in his lot with her would have meant, in his code of honesty, to signify his approval of all her acts. Therefore he remained apart from her.

But the most vital reason lay in Urquhart's lack of what we sometimes carelessly speak of as "spiritual life," meaning thereby a life of *conscious* worship, of *conscious* prayer, of *conscious* Sacramental union. Such a life is *sui generis ;* it may be intense, it may be feebly stirring, but in any case it is a different thing from an unconscious life. No one can have had a more intense inner life than Urquhart. That life was one prolonged thought of holiness, one prolonged prayer of action; one "daily and hourly endeavour to be a Christian." But it was the intense healthful, bounding life of youth that has not realised itself—a life so occupied with the life of the world around that it cannot be interested in its own.

Urquhart's life, moreover, was one of heroic reparation, springing from intense repentance for an act which he alone judged and condemned as a crime.

Just as he stood alone in his condemnation of the age, so he stood alone in his condemnation of himself.

In this, is he not at one with some of the great saints of the Church—with Ignatius Loyola himself ?

But as he followed the Truth, as it seemed to him, in his condemnation of himself, so he followed it later on in the judgment he passed on the Church.

"If the Church is divine," he said to his wife at the time of the Vatican Council, "she will take her stand firmly on the side of right, against all the Governments in the world. If she does so, I will be a Catholic."

It was a test, and an unfair one, though that Urquhart did not realise.

Man may not, moreover, bargain with God and His Church.

Therefore, like Moses from the heights of Pisgah, Urquhart viewed a Promised Land which he never entered.

But, unlike Moses, he came to think that the Promised Land was only a mirage; his want of faith shut him out, not only from the Land, but from the consolation of knowing it was there.

Nevertheless, those who could best judge of him were more than content to leave him, like Moses, in the hands of the God he had so faithfully served.

The Catholic priests who knew him most intimately, however much they regretted his attitude towards the Church, were not seriously disturbed by it.

They stood with veneration before a life of so great devotion.

They saw that he achieved what others only talked of or aspired to.

"He followed up to the heights," said one, after his death, "the light he had. God will look after him."

CHAPTER XIII

THE APPEAL TO THE POPE

"Thou spakest sometimes in visions unto Thy
Saints and saidest:
I have laid help upon One that is mighty,
I have exalted one chosen out of the people."
Psalm lxxxix. (Prayer Book Version.)

"Justitia et Judicium præparatio sedis tuæ"
Psalm lxxxviii. (Vulgate.)

"For myself, I cease not night or day from the task, nor have ceased since the light broke in upon me and showed me to myself to be a reprobate and an assassin."

So Urquhart wrote to Baron Schroeder in 1868. For more than forty years had this ceaseless toil gone on. In the accomplishment of the expiation which he had marked out for himself he had suffered the loss of career, reputation, friends, health, and means. But his efforts had never relaxed. After each losing battle he prepared for another, hoping against hope to open the eyes of his fellow-men to the mortal sin in which the world was involved. In his own country there was a steady design to keep him from gaining the public ear. "For years," he said, "I have tried in vain to get myself prosecuted."

Joined to the conspiracy of silence was a conspiracy of ridicule, and those who had most to fear from what he could say laughed loudest and longest.

In the East he had never lost the hearing he had gained. Amongst working men there had always been those unsophisticated enough to understand the simple morality he preached.

Now he had gained another public, this time amongst the Catholics of France. "There are two sets of people," he wrote to his friend Rustem Bey, the Turkish Envoy in

Italy, before the Sultan's visit to Europe in 1867, "with whom it would be worth while to establish an understanding—the English working man and the French Catholic party. All the rest are blind."

It was with the French Catholics that he was to establish his warmest relations.

The châlet among the snows of the Alps was impossible as a winter residence. The first winter of his life abroad found him with his wife and family at Nice. There he met the Bishop of Orleans, Mgr. Dupanloup. The two were mutually attracted, Urquhart by the Bishop's "immense capacity," Dupanloup apparently by Urquhart's deep insight into the political situation, especially as regards Russia.

It was, however, in the little town of Rheims, thronged with the memories of her past greatness, wistful with the mysterious prophecies of her future sufferings, that the direction of Urquhart's future work was decided. It was one of those strange happenings of which his life was full, one of those chance encounters which point to the guiding of a Providence in the working out of a fate. Rheims was at that time the centre of a little school of French Canonists, a circle of men sufficiently humble but withal learned and devout. They heard of Urquhart and saw some of his writings through the visits to Rheims of a French lawyer of Belfort, Juvigny. They were amazed and delighted. "For years," said one, the Père Jullion, "have I been cast down by the thought that Justice had left the world; have I been searching in vain for a man who, knowing what we had lost, would work with me to restore it. At last I have found him."

At the pressing invitation of two members of the little group, Père Jullion and the Abbé Defourny, Urquhart went to Rheims.

That visit was the beginning of a close and intimate friendship with Juvigny, Père Jullion, the Abbé Defourny, Père Aymond, and "the saint" of the little circle, Père Philippe. Not only were his words on Righteousness, Justice, the sin, danger, and evil in which the world lay,

understood almost before he uttered them, but words from which his own might have been taken went out to answer them. There at Rheims, for the first time, the Canon Law was opened to him. His astonishment and delight knew no bounds. Here was the goal of his lifelong search.

But, on the very threshold, he was faced with a difficulty. "Why," he asked, "if this is the Law of your Church, does not the Church proclaim it to the world? Why do Catholics fight in the unjust wars of their Governments without raising a protest? Why do Catholic nations know no more of public morality than Protestant?" Père Collet, the secretary of the Bishop of Geneva, answered him: "It is because out of our Catechisms we have dropped the teaching of the Law; because no longer do we teach our children that unjust war is robbery and murder."

By this time Urquhart had many Catholic friends in England. Not to speak of his devoted disciples, Monteith and Lord Denbigh, he had gained the ear of Archbishop Manning, to whom Père Jullion wrote: "I believe that Mr Urquhart, who is evidently chosen of God, who bears in his soul an image come straight down from Heaven in his great intellect, is nearer to the Catholic Church than he thinks, and is at the same time more Catholic than many of our French Catholics.

"If God had not showered upon him His grace, his intelligence could not have risen to such a height, in his contemplations of the Will of God, his heart could not have breathed forth so much supernatural love for the well-being of all humanity, nor could his will have been strong enough to raise his glorious banner with so full a determination to carry it triumphant through all the world."

Abroad he had warm friends and allies in Mgr. Mermillod, the Auxiliary Bishop of Geneva, and in the Bishops of Rodez and Mayence, not to speak of Mgr. Franchi and several Eastern ecclesiastics of high rank.

Nevertheless, it was not by any suggestion on the part of his Catholic friends, but purely of his own initiative, that he decided to appeal to Pius IX. for the restoration of the Canon Law, of whose existence he had but just learnt.

The Appeal was sent to Pius IX. in the first days of 1869, under cover of a Latin letter, of which the following is a translation:

"On this, the first day of a year which will be memorable in the eyes of generations to come, I approach the highest Court of human power and lay this book at the feet of your Holiness.

"My purpose in writing it, and my object in offering it, is that it may serve to bend human ends to serve your will.

"That will, so far as I understand it, is that the Law of Nations and the laws of man may be sanctified and preserved; that laws despised and compacts broken may be so written on the hearts of men that the world may be led back to peace and confidence.

"Holy Father, you have set in motion a means, in the Council about to be held, whereby a voice which we may regard as the Voice of God Himself may go forth from the Assembly of the Faithful to the whole world.

"In the name of those who stand without, I declare that we will listen to this voice instead of the voice of Kings or the laws which we accept to-day, if it will show us a way whereby we may be free from public guilt.

"Power is two-edged and glory is vain; there is nothing powerful or lasting save that which provides a remedy for the ills and errors of men.

"In your hands lies that power. Other power or hope is there none.

"I pray you, Holy Father, to call forth the lofty understanding which is an everlasting possession of the Roman Church; to exercise that knowledge known of old as the knowledge of things human and divine by which pagan Rome was greatly known and revered.

"This, too, depends on your Holiness' power and will.

"By your royal power, by your ancient title, by the memory of the past, by the very language which you speak, I pray your Holiness to come to the aid of an unhappy world which can neither bear nor cure the ills under which it labours.

"DAVID URQUHART."[1]

[1] This letter in Latin, with the five points of the Appeal, is given on p. 1309. No. 365 of the Appendix to the "Acta et Decreta SS. Con: Vat:" under the following heading:

David Urquhart, protestans, rationis in superiore documento propositæ acer propugnator, dedicat Summo Pontifici librum, quem in-

In appealing to the Pope Urquhart appealed to the whole Catholic world.

But the Appeal is much more than an Appeal. It is a serious indictment of modern Governments; it is a reasoned and progressive statement of the harm that has been done to the world by the quiet setting aside of Law by those in power, and the silent submission of the people to such disregard—a submission born of ignorance and indifference.

It shows that such indifference was the fault of those who, having received the Law as a sacred deposit, had neglected, through ignorance, cowardice, or self-love, to proclaim it. Now, however, things had come to such a pass, so blinded were men by self-love, so convinced were they that falsehood and wrong were truth and justice by the false use of words such as "civilisation," "progress," "public opinion," that only one voice could reach them, the voice of the Head of Christendom.

Not only was the Pope alone able to speak to the world, but it was his bounden duty to do it. The Head of a mere Religious Sect might hold his peace and, for his own comfort and ease, condone the crimes of the civil Government under which he lived. But the Pope lived under no Government. He was an independent sovereign; moreover, he was the Father of Christendom; all the children of men were his children. Should war break out he must condemn the wrong side, he must show where Justice lay, or how could his children know their duty?

---

scripsit *Appel d'un Protestant au Pape pour le rétablissement du droit public des nations*, affirmatque nullam aliam, præterquam Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, reperiri auctoritatem quæ recto codici juris gentium inter homines restituendo par esse possit. Ad hoc præclarum munus vocari futurum Concilium œcumenicum. Hujus silentium violati illius juris comprobatum fore.

This description may be translated as follows:

David Urquhart, a Protestant and a fierce protagonist of the policy set forth in the accompanying document, dedicates to the Supreme Pontiff a book which he calls: *The Appeal of a Protestant to the Pope for the Restoration of the Law of Nations*. He declares that there is no other authority but that of the Catholic Church, which can restore to man the true code of the Law of Nations.

He maintains that the Œcumenical Council is called to this noble task, that for her to be silent would be to condone the violations of that Law.

The Pope had proclaimed, and rightly proclaimed, that he had authority over "the consciences not only of men but of communities, peoples, and their sovereigns"; but until he had defined the Law as it was defined in the past he could not exert that authority. The Law must be proclaimed, and must be applied to present needs, and to each case as it arose. To that end there was need of a School of Public Law where diplomatists could be taught Law and its applications, not only to war, but to Congresses, to Treaties, and to Protocols, and where priests could be trained as in the Mediæval Universities, that they might teach their people.

It was false and futile to say that the Church could keep out of politics and ought to do so. She could only do so by condoning wrong. Did not the great Popes of the past exercise authority over the Rulers of the world? Did not even Alexander VI. interfere to try and prevent injustice on the part of the King of Portugal? Did Pius VII. keep out of politics when he drew upon himself the vengeance of Napoleon by refusing to subscribe to the Berlin and Milan Decrees? or when he refused to have anything to do with the Congress of Vienna? Did Gregory XVI. keep out of politics when he protested before Europe against the cruelties inflicted on Poland by a Power before whom they all crouched, and against whom only he stood upright?

No Catholic could keep out of politics; much less could the Head of the Catholic Church. If the Pope did not bring the world under the dominion of Law, the world would bring him under that of force. The sole hope of the world for moral regeneration lay in the Pope. Law was dead; Justice was dead; and Peace and Goodwill had fallen with them into the grave.

"Pius IX.," so he concludes his argument, "combines qualifications so dissimilar and so eminent that he seems to have been providentially raised up for the need of the world, being at once an Ecclesiastic who has applied his mind to analytical exercises and a Sovereign who is one not in name only, as are the other Sovereigns of Europe, but in power also. Were the Catholic Church of one mind

with the Pope the work would be done, or, rather, it would not require to be done. His difficulties are with his own flock, at once incapable of following his thought and comprehending and admiring the courage displayed on so many occasions by the greatest Pontiff who has ever sat on the throne of St. Peter."

The Appeal was sent to Pius IX. in March, 1869, under cover of a brief personal appeal that the restoration of the Canon Law might be included in the work of the forthcoming Council. It was at the same time circulated both amongst Protestants and Catholics.

It received a very varied reception. The Bishop of Rodez referred to it in terms of the highest commendation in his Lenten Pastoral; Archbishop Manning expressed his entire concurrence with what Urquhart had said, but disapproved of any appeal to the Pope, "save by the accustomed channels." It is not too much to say that Catholics generally were sympathetic. Urquhart himself said that even when they did not approve they at least understood his meaning. In almost all cases where they showed want of sympathy it was due to political causes. His greatest foe was not Protestantism—Protestants were for the most part indifferent—but Gallicanism.

Urquhart was an Ultramontane of the Ultramontanes. He was convinced that it was the Pope he wanted and no one else, and he used to the full the opportunities which his position outside the Church gave him of going direct to the fountain head.

"Si j'eusse été Catholique," he writes, "au lieu d'avoir eu, comme vous le supposez, un champ plus libre, j'aurais eu la bouche fermée avant, pour ainsi dire, de l'avoir ouverte." But he was determined that his mouth should not be shut until at least he had said his say to the Pope.

By the unimpeded attraction of his mind towards reality he saw that the Pope was the great need of the world, both as Temporal Sovereign and as Spiritual Head. As the Sovereign of a temporal kingdom, albeit the smallest in Europe, he might make his Court the home of pure diplomacy based on Law, for on Law alone could his kingdom

rest amid the armed forces of Europe. Standing there unmolested among them it would be an example of the power of Law.

If the Law could be re-established and its reign once more set up, the Papacy as a Temporal Sovereignty would stand with it; if not it must go. For no power in the world could exist without force in an age openly lawless.

The Papal Infallibility was a fact which admitted to him of no argument. It followed directly upon his conviction that it is in the power of man to be right.

"If truth is to be found anywhere in the world," he said in a letter on the subject, "it can only be found in a community which has the power of not falling into error. For a Catholic that power must reside somewhere, for that is the foundation of his belief. And, if it resides in a community it must be crystallised, so to speak, in the head of the community, or where is his authority? Do you think the Infallibility means that the Pope may say what he likes and everyone must say Amen? That would be the only excuse for objecting to it. Instead of calling it the Dogma of Infallibility it ought to be called the 'Obligation of Denial.' The Pope's Infallibility means that he is bound to contradict a novel interpretation; he must denounce a heresy, excommunicate a heretic, displace an Ecclesiastic who has become one, and at once preserve his authority as Chief and the unity of the Faith as a Religion."

To Urquhart the Pope was to be the Infallible Voice, the Law-Giver to the world, the Sovereign of a State supreme in its perfect obedience to Law.

Just as the Pope could not submit to any voice within the Church, so he could submit to no authority in the world.

"Il sent," said Père Jullion, writing of Urquhart to the Bishop of Malines, "que le Pape est pour la société humaine ce que le soleil est pour la terre, c'est-a-dire le flambeau de la vérité. Il sent que le Pape seul doit être pour le monde l'interprète de la loi de sainteté et de justice. Il sent que le Pape est le juge suprême qui doit prononcer, au dernier ressort, sur les litiges qui peuvent surgir entre les rois et les rois, entre les nations et leurs souverains."

It is obvious that such a temper as this would find little

favour among those Catholics who were anxious to propitiate their Governments, already restive under what they, for the most part, considered Pius IX.'s high-handed procedure in calling a Council without consulting Kings and Cabinets.

Above all was this the case with the French clergy of the Gallican school. It seemed to them that the Pope had done his best to quench their hopes of a national Church, not so much by calling a Council, as by the way in which he had done it. M. Ollivier's speech in the Assembly was distinctly disquieting to them. The French Government, he indicated, had never before been so ignored by any Pope in summoning a Council. Pius IX. must not therefore complain if Rome had to put up with the consequences of his high-handed action. "L'histoire le constatera bien," he said, "c'est Rome qui la première jette le défi aux societés séculaires, respectueuses devant elle. C'est Rome la première qui les agite, les provoque et les appelle à la lutte. C'est Rome qui leur dit 'Je me place en dehors de vous; je brise de mes propres mains le pacte qui nous liait, le contrat qui nous unissait.' "

It was not to be expected that the Gallicans who saw their dearest schemes endangered by a policy which could be so described, however unfairly, should subscribe to a document which placed the Pope on a pedestal above all Governments, and bade him put into the hands of the peoples the means of curbing their power.

Hence Urquhart lost the support, not only of the extreme Gallicans, but also of Mgr. Dupanloup and all his following. For Dupanloup was a keen politician, and, in spite of his subsequent loyal submission to the Decrees of the Council it was scarcely to be expected that he would surrender his political ambitions in order to support a scheme which was after all, to him, but of secondary importance.

Still, in spite of hard work and disappointment, the three years immediately preceding the General Council of 1870 were more full of hope and encouragement than all Urquhart's previous life had been.

He found, as he said, that Law still existed in the Catholic

Church, though it might be hidden. Catholics understood him at once when he spoke of it, the necessity for its restoration, and the havoc which had been wrought by its forsaking.

There were some also to whom his words were almost like a new Gospel. As he had owed the friends of his earlier life to his exertions for the redemption of England, his efforts against the injustice and despotism of the Government, his devoted toil amongst the working men, so he now drew around him by this Appeal to the Pope a circle equally devoted but widely different.

He was now a citizen of the world, and those whom he had known for years were drawn closer to him by a new tie. Such was Fréderic Le Play. They had known each other since Urquhart was in the Diplomatic Service and Le Play a young mining engineer to whom an accident had given leisure to reflect on the social miseries of his country. Their minds had journeyed by parallel ways; for both the path of knowledge lay through the East.

"J'ai lu," writes Le Play in 1868, "avec grand plaisir l'article intitulé 'Erroneousness of Modern Ideas.' Il est très vrai que tout homme qui étudie à fond le régime actuel de la féodalité en Orient doit arriver vite à comprendre l'erreur des idées modernes sur le progrès, la civilisation, la démocratie. Nous sommes, l'un et l'autre, arrivés au même résultat en étudiant cette même région. . . . Ainsi je vous comprend à demi mot."

M. Le Play, like Urquhart, was full of admiration for the Eastern peoples, and for their social organisation built on the family.

"Il y vit," writes his biographer, Edmond Bouchié de Belle, "l'existence de chaque homme assuré et chaque homme content de son sort. Surtout nul trace de cet antagonisme de classe qui empoisonnait la vie des nations avancées."

It was in the East that both these truly great men came upon Law as the bed-rock of social existence. Fréderic Le Play found it in social relations as David Urquhart had found it underneath the hard, rough life of the Mussulman soldier.

In the Decalogue M. Le Play found the simplest as well as the highest expression of that Law. By his studies in the East he made his way back from Saint-Simonism to the Catholic Church through the avenues of Law and Justice.

By the same way Urquhart had come to the throne of St. Peter to beg for the re-establishment of Law in the world.

Both had found that what the world wanted was Law, but Urquhart had gone a step farther than M. Le Play. He had found that at the root of all social disaster was the want of Law between nations, and that without it not only was municipal Law of no avail, but it could not even exist. Unobserved Law, he said, was worse than no Law. It poisons all society at its roots.

It was from Urquhart that M. Le Play absorbed the idea of International Justice. The references he makes to it in the third and fourth editions of the *Réforme Sociale* were directly due to Urquhart's influence.

"Je trouverai," he writes, "une occasion prochaine de propager votre idée favorite de la justice internationale. Mon éditeur m'annonce l'épuisement prochain de la troisième édition de la *Réforme Sociale*. Dans la quatrième édition je me propose d'insister sur l'idée de justice; de citer en regard de ce nouveau paragraph les passages de vos écrits que vous me signalerez comme résumant votre doctrine sur le moindre volume."

He had a great admiration for the matter and form of the *Diplomatic Review.*

"I am ill," he says in one of his letters, "but that illness has given me compulsory leisure.

"I have profited by it to read your pamphlet on the Council, and the French article in the last number of the *Diplomatic Review.*

"I must make an effort to express to you the extreme pleasure which I have received from the perusal of both these works.

"They have aroused in me, for the hundredth time, the desire of bringing out a weekly organ whose aim shall be to combat the false ideas which are disintegrating Western Society.

"Your ideas would take the first place in this Review, together with those which would tend to re-establish order in the fundamental elements of private life.

"You help me to understand how it is that the grass grows to-day over the places which were Babylon, Nineveh, Carthage, and many other cities known to fame."

M. Le Play rejoiced over the General Council. It would be a great thing for the world if the age of Councils were to begin again. But he was not hopeful as to Urquhart's success in bringing before the world ideas whose greatness and importance he himself recognized. For Urquhart was a bad propagandist. He would not put himself in the place of the ignorant and stupid.

"Voici," said M. Le Play, "trente ans que vous voyez et annoncez la vérité et votre nom reste inconnu, en dehors d'un petit nombre d'hommes éminents qui vous ont compris. . . ."

Why was this ? Le Play himself answers the question.

"Je m'éxplique l'ignorance où l'on reste touchant vos excellentes idées par le fait que vous n'avez pas pris la peine immense pour les rendre intelligibles à un public intellectuellement perverti. J'ose vous conseiller ce travail avant toute entreprise de propagande active."

He goes on to point out the infinite labour he had himself bestowed upon the successive editions of the *Réforme Sociale* in order that they might commend themselves to a public for whom "il faut presque créer le langage, car le public reste entièrement étrange aux choses et n'est nullement préparé à les comprendre."

M. Le Play was one of the few people whose criticisms Urquhart bore with patience. He not only took exception to the want of patience his English friend took in trying to commend his ideas to the public, he fell upon his handwriting. "Vos idées," he said, "sont mes délices mais votre écriture est mon désespoir."

He did not hesitate to animadvert on the extreme inaccuracy which often made it impossible to verify a quotation or an historical fact from any references which he gave in his writings.

"Mon cher ami," he writes, "Notre célèbre Cardinal de Retz, voulant un jour dominer une émeute populaire, au temps de la Fronde, inventa un passage de Cicéron à l'appui de sa politique, et la fit accepter par ses auditeurs, qui cherchèrent ensuite vainement sa sentence.

"Je défends en ce moment vos idées sur la Turquie en présence d'Arméniens de distinction; et je leur cite l'admirable précepte du Koran, cité par vous à la page 57 de la traduction du *Portfolio* qui m'a été envoyée récemment.

"Mes Arméniens m'ont ri au nez, en m'assurant que vous aviez suivi l'exemple de notre Cardinal et que ledit texte était de votre invention.

"Je me suis mis alors à lire une traduction estimée du Koran, celle de Kasimirski, et je n'ai point trouvé ledit texte. N'ayant pas le temps de relire cet ouvrage avec plus d'attention, je vous serais obligé de me signaler le passage en question, par le *chapitre* et le *verset*."

Urquhart's attitude not only to M. Le Play but to several of his French friends, was his most complete vindication against the charges of those who maintained that Urquhart could not breathe in an atmosphere of criticism. He could not, it is true, bear the criticism of ignorance on subjects on the study of which he had spent the strength and work of a lifetime, and it was not an easy thing to find men whose knowledge was equal to his own.

But on the rare occasions when he came across superior knowledge he was willing to take the learner's place even on his own subjects. At the Pope's feet he always sat in admiration for his moral character, respect for his knowledge, and reverence for his position.

In his relations with many Roman ecclesiastics he had some faint foreshadowings of the fulfilment of a dream which, as he told his wife, had recurred again and again. He seemed, he said, to be in the company of people against whose intelligence and knowledge he could make no headway; who treated him in argument as he was accustomed to treat those who had the temerity to come to him prepared to show him his mistakes. "They take my words," he would say, "and show fallacies in them all, and in the end they oblige me to own myself utterly and entirely wrong."

To his reverence for the Pope Urquhart added sympathy for his loneliness. He felt that few, if any, understood the deep passion in his heart for Justice; he knew that he himself did, for it was the passion of his own heart. After his first audience he felt that he had a friend in the Holy Father. "It makes my heart feel warm," he said, "when after a long discussion with some Cardinals or officials, who seem drowned in trivialities, I let my thoughts go back to the Vatican and think he at least is on my side. What else matters ?"

Perhaps the little scene which Mrs. Urquhart describes in her diary when first he learnt that the Pope had received and approved of his Appeal was one of the happiest memories of his life.

"We went in the evening," she says, "to the Bishop, Mgr. Mermillod,[1] and he told us the news from Rome. He took us apart into his study, and said, 'I have just come back from Lucerne, from the Nuncio, and I have a message for you. All is accepted. He has sent on all your letters to Rome and expects very soon to have a written answer for you.' The expression of countenance and eager manner of the Bishop said even more than his words—like those of a man who has much important intelligence to impart."

In spite of such encouragement, however, the goal was not yet won. Though eminent Roman ecclesiastics or even the Pope himself might sympathise whole-heartedly with Urquhart's ideas, nothing could be done, the re-establishment of Public Law could not even be considered by the Council, unless a proposal for such a consideration were to be laid before it by a definite body of Catholic opinion.

[1] Mgr. Mermillod was one of Urquhart's warmest sympathisers. In 1864 he was appointed Auxiliary Bishop of Geneva, with the title of Bishop of Hebron, and in 1873 Vicar Apostolic of Geneva. The new Apostolic Vicarate was not acknowledged either by the States Council of Geneva, or by the Swiss Federal Council, and Mermillod was banished from Switzerland. The decree of expulsion was, however, rescinded when, on the death of the Bishop of Lausanne, Mermillod became Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, and the Apostolic Vicarate fell into abeyance. In 1890, he was raised to the Cardinalate and summoned to Rome by Leo XIII.

Neither Pope nor Council could originate. Here was the great *crux*. Who was to present that article as a point, indeed Urquhart thought it the chief point, for the consideration and decision of the Council ?

As he looked round upon the ecclesiastics of all European countries he saw no hope that any of them would take so definite a line. There were underlying diplomatic reasons why they should all sit on a hedge.

Archbishop Manning would fear to offend Mr. Gladstone with whom he was known to be friendly, and the English bishops would follow his lead.

The position in France was extremely critical, besides which, the Church, as we have seen, was riddled with Gallicanism, and the great aim of the Gallican bishops was to go as far as possible with their Government.

The Prussian Government would not be likely to favour any strong attempt to proclaim a Law which her great hope was to be able to hide in forgetfulness; nor the Austrian to do anything to offend Russia, the fear of whom was always before her eyes.

Urquhart looked to the East for help. If the bishops of the East would, with the full concurrence of the Ottoman Government, present such an article for the consideration of the Council the chief difficulty was removed.

As far back as 1850 Urquhart had had intimate dealings with the Armenian Catholic Nation, with its two Patriarchates of Mount Lebanon and Constantinople. These dealings, as well as his long-continued friendship with the Ottoman Government, stood him now in good stead. He would use both Catholics and Mussulmans to help in the great crusade for Law and Justice in which, all unknown to one another, they had often been united.

It as deeply concerned the Ottoman as it did the Papal Government that Law should once more be observed by the European Powers, since all the disasters which had of late years befallen both were the direct result of its non-observance. It was the part of both to speak out boldly of the dangers which would result from a continuance of its

non-observance, and to point out from which direction those dangers would come.

Neither need apprehend any harm from a plain speaking of which all the other Governments were afraid, since on them had already fallen all the evil which could befall them.

This point of view Urquhart expressed in a letter to the Papal Nuncio as well as to Fuad Pasha, the Grand Vizier. To Fuad Pasha he said:

"I send you a little leaflet, the *Œuvre Apostolique*, on the action which we hope the Œcumenical Council will take with regard to illegal and unjust wars, and to acts of war such as those of Garibaldi and the armed pirates who have infested Bulgaria and Candia. I hope that your Highness will think well to support this undertaking either by recommending it to the Catholic bishops with whom you have occasion to come into contact, or even by a communication on your own part to the Holy See itself."

Urquhart hoped great things from Fuad Pasha, who had an interview with the Pope while he was in Italy in 1868. The Pope, according to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, received the Grand Vizier with "great cordiality," described the Sultan as his *meilleur ami* among the Sovereigns of Europe, and spoke gratefully of the just treatment which his children received under the Ottoman rule. When Fuad Pasha expressed his regret that the Sultan on his late tour through Europe had found himself unable to visit Rome, the Pope replied: "Who knows but that I may go and see him in Constantinople? You are not ignorant that Christ has given me all the earth. My Empire extends far beyond the Dardanelles, but unlike that of a neighbouring Monarch offers no danger to your Master." He laughingly compared his own position menaced by Piedmont to that of the Sultan menaced by Russia, and added, "At least your Sovereign believes in his prophet, but the other Governments of our own day scarcely believe in God."

Fuad Pasha, to Urquhart's despair, died shortly after his audience, and the hopes which had been placed in his knowledge and sympathy were not realised.

He redoubled his own efforts to promote a complete understanding between East and West. "If this reaches you at Naples," he wrote to Rustem Bey, "and you return

by Rome, pray see yourself the Bishop of Orleans and rouse him up by a few indignant and energetic words. He is a man of such great capacity that you can reprove him and reproach him with profit, and he is so surrounded and drowned in persons and personalities that he requires rousing."

To the Sultan he wrote himself as follows:

"His Holiness the Pope has convoked an Assembly of all the prominent Ecclesiastics of the Church of Rome to try to discover some means of arresting the impending ruin of European Society. This means can only be the Restoration of Law, for Society is menaced with ruin only because Governments and people meddle in each other's affairs, carry disorder into the dominions of their neighbours, or seize their territories. Since such crimes have been habitual amongst Christians the nations are obliged to be always prepared either for attack or defence. Taxes are an overwhelming burden and the disorder of external affairs has its counterpart in the heart and intelligence of men. It is this state of affairs that the Pope deplores and to which he would put an end. But he cannot do it without the help and co-operation of Your Majesty.

"The promulgation and restatement of Public Law as a duty and religious obligation is the only measure which will correspond with this pronouncement of the Holy Father, as it is the only possible remedy to the disorders to which he would put an end. The bishops in Christian countries dare not propose that such an article be added to the work of the Council, dependent as they are on their Governments. Bishops, however, living under Your Majesty's sceptre are independent of the secular power, and this power being Mussulman, itself recognises the obligation which it is the object of the Pope to introduce amongst Christians. The bishops of the Ottoman Empire can therefore propose such an article, which the Christian bishops dare not reject, while some of them will receive it with joy. . . . But to give heart to the bishops of the East to risk the disfavour, and to incur the blame of their comrades of the West, it would be well that a word of encouragement should fall from the lips of Your Majesty. . . ."

This diplomatic letter succeeded.

The new Grand Vizier, Ali Pasha, was not as favourable to the Council as his predecessor had been, but no obstacle

was placed in the way of the attendance of the Eastern bishops, and they were distinctly encouraged to support Urquhart's plan.

But Urquhart did not confine his attentions to the Ottoman Government. He proposed to the Nuncio and to Mgr. Mermillod that an Address should be presented to the Eastern bishops suggesting that they should draw up a Postulatum for the Council. The plan was approved, and both the Nuncio and Mgr. Mermillod agreed in entrusting him with the task of drawing up the Address and indicating the lines of the Postulatum.

It was from the Armenian Synod that Urquhart desired the suggestion should emanate, without which the Council could not act. The Armenians of Constantinople and Mount Lebanon were now united under one Head, Mgr. Hassoun,[1] Patriarch of Constantinople, and to the Armenian bishops assembled in Synod Urquhart proposed to send a Mission. The difficulty was to find a person qualified to undertake such a Mission. He must be a Catholic, he must understand the East, he must be as enthusiastic as Urquhart about the restoration of Law. Lord Denbigh, one of those proposed, fulfilled one, if not two, of these requirements; Lord Stanley might have accompanied him, but the death of his father and the business connected with his taking over the estates prevented it.

Then Robert Monteith was proposed but held back, feeling his want of intimate knowledge of the East a drawback. When at last it was settled that Baron Schroeder, who had spent many years in Turkey, should accompany him, the Baron unfortunately paid a visit to Mr. Urquhart at the châlet, and was so alarmed by the overwhelming nature of Urquhart's discourse on the first evening of his arrival that he fled early in the morning, apparently fearing lest he should be compelled by force to so formidable an undertaking.

In the end Robert Monteith went alone, accompanied only by the longings and prayers of the little company which saw him off from the châlet, on the "roof of the world."

[1] See Vernier. *Histoire du Patriarchat Arménien Catholique.*

Urquhart's description to Monteith's wife of his going reads like a story of the departure of a knight on some high quest of old.

"The evening of our arrival," he says, "the Bishop was entirely occupied, and wrote to ask me to bring Mr. Monteith to the Évéché at 10 o'clock next morning. I, thinking that my presence might occasion some restraint, went in to Père Collet to wait whilst he went up. Presently the Bishop came down for me, and said, 'You must be present.'

"He then—and his whole look and bearing was, as it were, transformed—said to him: 'You go to the bishops of the East accredited by us, the bishops of the West, to show them how a common centre of action can be found in the Catholic Church for the protection of the world by the Restoration of Justice against, at the same time, its own decay and the operations of the enemy.' After some words from me[1] he continued: 'As you are going from us and from Protestants of a lowly order a providential union has been brought about.' Your husband then knelt down, and, laying his hand upon him, the Bishop said: 'I give you a special blessing for God's work on which you are going.'"

The Mission thus inaugurated proved successful even beyond the hopes of its inaugurators. The Armenian bishops assembled in Synod gave a reception overwhelming in its enthusiasm to the delegate, who was the more touched by it because he knew the intensity of Eastern reserve. They not only drew up a Petition to the Council, but a Vote of the Synod for the Restoration of the Law of Nations signed by all those present. This they forwarded to the Council by the Patriarch's Vicar-General, Mgr. Azarian.

The great idea had materialised at last. Here was something which the Council could not refuse to consider. When Monteith's telegram containing the joyful news reached the "roof of the world" Mrs. Urquhart wrote in her diary: "Bless the Lord, oh my soul, and all that is within me bless His Holy Name."

At once David Urquhart and his wife made preparations to go to Rome for the Council. Robert Monteith lent them his house, the "Tempietto," and there they established themselves in November, 1869.

[1] Urquhart said: "He goes from you and he is the representative of a large body of English working men."

CHAPTER XIV

THE VATICAN COUNCIL

"Princes in all lands."
Psalm xlv. (Prayer Book Version.)

It was as no stranger amongst strangers that Urquhart found himself in Rome at the most unique event in the history of his time—the opening of the Vatican Council on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception.[1]

Rome was full of friends who were prepared to give him vigorous and generous support; and in spite of the intrigues of his enemies, in spite of his own refusal to make the very slightest inclination in the House of Rimmon, in spite of his outspokenness in season and out of season, he lost scarcely anyone to his cause and he gained many.

It was not without extreme misgivings that some of his best friends had heard of his projected visit. Lord Denbigh and Mr. Monteith, with all their affectionate devotion to him, could not with equanimity imagine him riding a-tilt against Catholic deliberation and Italian prejudice. Both wrote urgent letters to Mrs. Urquhart marked "Strictly private," begging her to use all her influence to induce in her husband the "prudence and calmness" so essentially alien to his temperament and methods of work. But their prognostications of disaster were unfulfilled. After all, Urquhart was a man of the world, and a diplomatist by training, and he probably saw for himself that the volcanic methods which had been necessary, in his eyes, to arouse his apathetic fellow-countrymen to action, would not only be unnecessary but wholly unsuitable in dealing with the officials of the Court of the Vatican, men with minds keen and sensitive as his own, for all their caution and deliberation. Urquhart in Rome, without sacrificing one of his principles, allowed

[1] December 8, 1869.

his natural charm of manner to assert itself in a way that won him many friends.

His propaganda of Turkish baths took the agreeable form of throwing open his own to any rheumatic sufferer whom the keen winds of Rome had shrewdly touched. French and Italian dignitaries forgot to censure the rudeness of "the mad Englishman" who refused to clasp the hands they affably extended to him when, with Eastern grace and dignity, he kissed them instead.

Urquhart was, moreover, for the first time in his life, thrown into the midst of a diplomatic society which he could respect. Whatever may be said, and said with truth, of the wheels within wheels which were at work in the huge Conciliar machine; whatever may be said of conflicting interests and subterranean plans, of plots and counterplots woven by Governments, who used often unsuspecting bishops as their cats' paws, there is no doubt that the diplomatic atmosphere of Rome was the only one in Europe in which a man of Urquhart's sense—an exaggerated sense it would seem to many—of honour and honesty could breathe.

He could be himself. He was not for ever on the defensive against the spirit of the age. He could expand and glow. His great fiery soul could radiate light and heat around him when the chilling stream of criticism and contempt was not constantly playing upon it.

Rome, whether it agreed with him or not, understood him. For the first time in his life he found himself in a society whose native atmosphere was his own, that of the mountain heights of honour and justice, of true charity, and high and noble statecraft.

There is no part of Urquhart's life which is so pleasant to dwell upon as the story of his life in Rome. All his apparently egotistical pride and self-assertion dropped away. Meek he could never be, but he was humble as a gentleman among his like. He never let slip without criticism a loose or vague or mistaken word, but he called attention to it as an equal, not as a schoolmaster. He showed the deep reverence as well as the lofty contempt of which he was capable.

When her husband's own character and manner would

have barred the way to success, Mrs. Urquhart was always at his side to open it for him. Always gentle, always courteous, though as firm as he in matters of principle, she moved among the ecclesiastics of East and West who assembled at their house in the Via Sistina, obviously impressing her guests not less by her fine intelligence than by her reverent humility, in the presence of those whom she counted her superiors. Even at great meetings of bishops, when "ladies and laymen were not admitted," her presence as well as that of her husband's was taken for granted. Many of those whom she now met for the first time were prepared to acknowledge their indebtedness to her. She had long acted as her husband's secretary, and had thus had no insignificant share in rendering intercourse with him less of a strain than it might have been, if not to the brain and temper, at least to the eyes. "Mes compliments à votre secrétaire," had been the message sent to her by many an overworked bishop whom David Urquhart's epistles, brilliant indeed, but maddening in their illegibility, must have driven to desperation. What her handwriting was in his letters her influence was in the work of his life, something which made it possible for others to appreciate and, whether they sympathised or not, at least to see it presented in its best and most reasonable aspect. Never was that influence more untiringly exerted than in Rome, or with a more beneficent effect. And her work brought its own reward, for through her patience and charity under all that was repellent, petty, and apparently worldly and self-seeking, in the great men as well as the mean men, who took part in that great assemblage, she was enabled to keep her eyes fixed on the power, the virtue, the truth which were the real motive forces in the Council and in the men who made it up.

Though she did not become a Catholic in effect till seven years later, Mrs. Urquhart was one in spirit before she and her husband turned their backs on the Eternal City in May, 1870. Therefore, though, in her humility, she counted herself of less importance in this undertaking than in many another in which she had stood by her husband's side, it

was probably the growing attraction of her own mind which, unconsciously both to themselves and to her, drew many of the Catholic ecclesiastics to sympathetic consideration of the great cause.

The history of David Urquhart's connection with the Vatican Council is a page not only of unwritten but almost of secret history.

The materials for it, with the exception of the few but important documents contained in the *Acta et Decreta SS. Concilii Vaticani*, are only to be found in his own and his friends' letters. Official history and contemporary memoirs bestow, if they notice him at all, but a cursory glance on Urquhart and his connection with the Council.

His theory that Russia and Germany were manœuvring delays in order to prevent any pronouncement by the Holy See on the Law of Nations is unsupported by contemporary evidence. The fierce emotions which raged round the dogma of Infallibility and the bitter opposition it evoked, are enough in the eyes of most people to account for any effort being made to delay its promulgation.

On the other hand, in Urquhart's mind, the Papal Infallibility and the declaration before the world of the Canon Law were indissolubly united. It is worth noting that all his supporters were not only supporters of the dogma of Infallibility, but supporters of it in its widest sense; at the same time those who opposed the dogma were also enemies to his cause.[1]

Moreover, David Urquhart knew the intimate connection between East and West as no one else in Rome knew it. To him Russia's struggle for Constantinople, with all that it signified, was the key to European politics. Both Russia and Turkey in different senses were keenly interested in the proceedings of the Vatican Council. Russia dreaded all signs of a *rapprochement* between Rome and the East, a

[1] The only two Catholic priests who seriously opposed Urquhart's proposal for the re-establishment of the Law of Nations, were Père Hyacinth, of Old-Catholic fame, and Father Suffield, the Dominican, who afterwards left the Catholic Church to become a Unitarian.

It was in answer to Father Suffield that Urquhart wrote his pamphlet: *Effect on the World of the Restoration of the Canon Law: A Vindication of the Catholic Church against a Priest.*

dread she showed in her relentless persecution of the Uniats. Urquhart, on the other hand, saw in such a *rapprochement* the only hope of safety for both; and Mgr. Dupanloup, one of the ablest of politicians, shared his view when it was first presented to him.[1]

Whether, however, Urquhart was right in his unswerving conviction that Russia, in her fear that the promulgation by the Pope of a Law that would unite both East and West, used every means in her power, open and secret, to prevent such a promulgation, and that those who were opposing the dogma of Infallibility were unconsciously or, in some few cases, even consciously, her tools, we shall never know, unless the day should come when the secrets of the Russian Foreign Office are completely laid bare.

Meantime we can but tell the story as it is told in Urquhart's letters, and in those of the many eminent men—cardinals, bishops, priests and laymen—whom he drew into his magic circle.

When Mr. and Mrs. Urquhart came to Rome in November, 1869, they were faced with unlooked-for encouragements as well as unexpected disappointments. Their first disappointment was in the attitude of the Cardinal Secretary of State, Cardinal Antonelli, from whom Urquhart had been led to expect not only interest but help. Urquhart's friend Dr. Maupied[2] had written that the Cardinal had expressed "le plus vif intérêt" in his writings and in the *Appeal of a Protestant to the Pope.* He had received the news of Urquhart's projected visit to Rome "avec la plus parfaite bienveillance." "Ainsi," writes his friend, "vous pouvez venir en toute confiance, de ce côté, du moins." Urquhart went to see the Cardinal immediately on his arrival in Rome and found him useless as far as the cause was concerned. "Sincere but frivolous" was the estimate of his character.

"David," says Mrs. Urquhart in her diary, "has had his interview with Cardinal Antonelli. It made me feel

[1] See Correspondence between David Urquhart and the Bishop of Orleans published in the *Diplomatic Review*, February 2, 1870.

[2] Professor at the Sorbonne and Canon of Rheims.

in despair so that I wanted to leave Rome, for M. Maupied had made me think that he was quite favourable. The want of faith in these Princes of the Church struck me very much, until it came into my mind that it was I who was wanting in faith to be so cast down."

In spite of this disappointment, however, Urquhart had a unique position in Rome from the moment of his arrival —a position which grew more assured and more remarkable as he gained adherent after adherent among the Western bishops: the Easterns were his already. His house was common ground where East and West could meet, under conditions most favourable to a mutual understanding. He rallied round him Armenians, Maronites, United Greeks and Western cardinals and bishops as no one else in Rome, or indeed in Europe, could have done, for to many of these dignified Oriental prelates his name had been, from their cradles, a household word.

As soon as the Armenians arrived, with the Decrees passed by their Synod, a meeting was held at which assembled patriarchs and bishops of the East and West. At this meeting, which Mrs. Urquhart in writing to her son in Montreux called "a little Council of our own," Urquhart presided, introduced the prelates to one another, and spoke of the objects they had in view—"the re-establishment of Society on its three bases of justice, statesmanship and charity."

"And then," he says, writing to an absent friend, "I had nothing more to do. It was no longer for a Protestant and a layman to speak to bishops; it was for the bishops of the East to set forth to the bishops of the West the means of saving Society."

"You," said the Archbishop of Tyre, speaking at this memorable assembly, to his Western brethren, "are accustomed to call the Turks barbarians, and thereby you have acquired a habit of speaking of yourselves as civilised. But we believe these terms ought to be reversed."

No Eastern confessor, the Oriental bishops pointed out, could be called upon to absolve a man for murder in an unjust war. Unjust war in the European sense was un-

known to the Mussulman, "who could not draw the sword, even though he were the Sultan himself, except after a judicial sentence given." The indifference which prevailed in Christian nations as to the justice or injustice of war was to them, they said, living under Ottoman rule, a constant source of shame and terror.

By his knowledge of Eastern customs Urquhart was able to make life in Rome less strange and wearisome to the Oriental bishops than it might have been. He not only took a fatherly interest in their comfort, but he exerted himself to shield them from the corrupting influence of Western manners, which he never abhorred so wholeheartedly as when he saw them contrasted with the courteous dignity of the East.

"Your father," writes Mrs. Urquhart to young David in Montreux, "has great trouble with the Easterns, to keep them to their own habits and ways. People *will* shake hands with them and then, when invited to the large parties, they begin by leaving them to stand up in the crowd, as the Franks do, which they do not like at all. Now at Mr. Bodenham's and Mr. Monteith's last night he had a room settled up for them where they could smoke and sit down, into which ladies were not admitted, for they stare at them and do not behave at all well."

Urquhart's influence amongst the Eastern prelates was so much a recognised fact that he was begged by the Bishop of Geneva to use it in order to counteract the dangerous effect of the propaganda which was being carried on amongst them by Mgr. Dupanloup and his following in the Council.

It is an old story now that the strong opposition of which Mgr. Dupanloup was the leader was firmly convinced that it would not only be inopportune but dangerous to assert at that particular moment the dogma of Papal Infallibility. In the case of the French bishops, at least, the motive of the opposition was in the main political. Urquhart recognised this; he saw, too, that the enemies of the Holy See were making use of it in the hope of preventing any authoritative pronouncement which would give back peace to the world and strengthen her own position. Neither did he

consider the whole of the opposition as single-minded and pure in their intentions as was Mgr. Dupanloup.

"Il y a ici," he wrote to his friend Kinpresti Pasha, "une majorité simple, savante, bien-disposée, mais sans connaissance du monde et des affaires ou des pratiques parlementaires.

"Il y a une petite minorité tapageuse, insolente, révolutionaire, pan-slavist, bysantine et athée. Cette minorité demande au Pape de se refuser aux voix de la majorité, tout en déclarant qu'il cesse d'être Pape du moment qu'il cesse d'être en accord avec la majorité."

That Dupanloup should put himself at the head of this "petite minorité tapageuse" was the more grievous to Urquhart by reason of the great hopes he had entertained of him. An integral part of his design for the re-establishment of the Law of Nations was that diplomatic relations should be opened up between Rome and Constantinople, and that the two powers which still stood for Public Law in Europe should strengthen each other's hands by union. It was a bold idea to put before a French bishop, but Mgr. Dupanloup, when it was first presented to him in 1867,[1] had welcomed it. It would open, as he very well saw, a door for the reunion of the Slav populations with Rome. Counting upon his help, Urquhart had put the Bishop of Orleans into communication with many of his Eastern friends, including the Patriarch of the Maronites and several Oriental bishops. It was with a feeling little short of consternation that he discovered that the Bishop proposed to use the influence he had thus gained "to come to the Council followed by a phalanx of Eastern bishops prepared to support him against the dogma of Infallibility."

The Eastern Catholic world was already disturbed. A party among the Armenians, unsettled by the Bull *Reversus*, in which some of the bishops saw an attempt on the part of Rome to interfere with their freedom of election, had been stirred up by the French and Russian Governments, acting through their Embassies, into open

[1] Urquhart had, at Mgr. Dupanloup's request, drawn up, in 1867, a short memoir of the effect Russia had had on European politics. It was published in the *Diplomatic Review* in May, 1870.

rebellion against the Holy See.[1] When, on the top of this, the East was startled by the Bishop of Orleans' Pastoral warning the world that the East would look upon the proclamation of the dogma as an attempt to override their liberties, and that it would set up a barrier between East and West, there was great danger that the presence of the Easterns at the Council would end in a fiasco. "The Russian agents," says an Eastern missionary in 1869, "whether in our midst or among the schismatics or in the subsidised press of Constantinople, all bring forward the Pastoral of the Bishop of Orleans."

There had evidently been, as Urquhart very well saw, a *volte-face* on the part of the Bishop since their last meeting on the feast of St. Charles Borromeo in 1867. Since then, the communications between them had been infrequent and by letter, and Urquhart was not entirely certain what new position he would take up.

The request, however, of Mgr. Mermillod that he would try and counteract his influence with the Easterns required immediate attention. The moment was critical. It was the morning of the very day on which a great meeting of the Eastern and Western bishops with several influential laymen was to take place in order to consider how the Decrees of the Armenian Synod "De re militari et bello" should be presented to the Commission of the Council.

In the afternoon, before the others arrived, came the Eastern bishops to ask Urquhart what he advised them to do on the subject of Papal Infallibility.

Now to deny the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, as a doctrine, was in Urquhart's own words to deny the faith. But the word he loathed. It was one of those "hybrid words of modern invention" which obscured thought. Call it anything else: the "necessity of being always right," the "necessity of denial of error," anything but Infallibility, which to most people meant "the Pope can say what he likes, and everyone must say Amen."

[1] See *Le Patriarche Hassoun*, published at the *Diplomatic Review* office 1873. It contains the history of the schism and its connection with the Council.

With true diplomatic wisdom he refused to answer the question privately, and begged Mgr. Mermillod to put it to him in the meeting in the name of the Oriental bishops. He then answered as follows: "I understand no more than you do what is meant by the word Infallibility. To me the word is devoid of meaning. It is a modern word of evil days, and was unknown at the Council of Florence, which contains all that is necessary to establish in the Primacy this supreme Authority in the Church, which is necessary, not only for its integrity, but for the rectitude of conscience of each believer." "To this," says Urquhart, "there was neither opposition nor reply. The meeting proceeded with its business. It drew up two Postulata, both based on the Decrees of the Armenian Synod, one in Arabic, signed by the Eastern bishops, and another which was translated into Latin and signed not only by everyone present, but ultimately by many of the most prominent ecclesiastics in Rome.[1] Thus was justified Urquhart's

[1] De re Militari et Bello.

This Postulatum, of which the following is a translation, will be found on page 861 of the *Acta et Decreta SS. Con. Vat.*

"Postulatum from many bishops to be reverently laid before our most holy Lord, Pius IX. and the Sacrosanct Council of the Vatican:

"The present condition of the world has become almost insupportable by reason of the huge standing armies which are raised by conscription.

"The peoples groan under the burden which is laid upon them.

"The spirit of irreligion and the neglect of Law in so-called International Affairs open an easy way to wars, unlawful and unjust —or, to speak more truly, to the terrible slaughter which spreads over the world.

"Hence the resources of the poor are threatened, commercial relations are broken up, the conscience of men is involved in deep and deadly error, or it is grievously wounded, and many souls are plunged into eternal ruin.

"To so many and great evils the Church alone can provide a remedy.

"Though all will not listen to her voice, still she will ever stand forth as guide to countless thousands and, sooner or later, must produce an effect.

"Moreover, whatever is firmly established by eternal principles approves itself to the Divine Majesty, nor can it be without fruit.

"There are grave and serious men, versed in public affairs, who look upon the condition of the world and the Church in these matters in the same light as all holy men devoted to religion.

prophecy when he sent Monteith to Constantinople, that if the Easterns gave them a lead the Westerns would follow it.

Armed with this document Urquhart went to see the Bishop of Orleans. He was accompanied by his wife, who gives an account of the interview in her diary.

"After talking of the weather and my children, whom he had known at Nice, David said to him, 'Vos moments, Monseigneur, sont précieux. Je veux en profiter pour dire deux choses. La première est pour vous demander votre concurrence comme vous me l'avez promise à Orléans.' He then put into his hands the Postulatum. He read it, and putting it back into David's hands said, 'Et la seconde?' David said, 'Will you support me?'

"He answered, 'I cannot support this.'

"'May I ask your reasons?' said David. 'For there is nothing I have proposed which is not in the ancient Canons.'

"'I do not dispute the principle,' said the Bishop, 'but I deny the opportuneness.'

"'But,' said David, 'we have discussed all these things already at Orleans, and you then promised me your help.'

"'Il y a erreur dans tout ceci,' said the Bishop. 'Il y a eu malentendu.'

"David: 'Then that incident is over, and I may put the papers back in my pocket.'

"Upon this Dupanloup hesitated a little, and then said: 'Si le Pape nous fait ces propositions je les accepterai, mais s'il me consulte sur l'opportunité je le conseillerai de ne pas le faire.'"

This was the utmost which Urquhart could obtain. The Bishop, whose subsequent conduct gives some reason for the supposition that his own heart sided with Urquhart

---

"All these are equally persuaded of the necessity for a declaration of that part of the Canon Law which deals with the Law of Nations, and with the character of war, and defines how it becomes either a duty or a crime.

"When the moral conscience of men shall have thus been instructed, then shall we see the removal of the dangers which now hang over us, an end which we cannot hope to attain either by worldly prudence or by political adjustments.

"This Postulatum, which was presented February 10, 1870, was signed by forty Conciliar Fathers."

Postulatum B.—*i.e.*, the Postulation of the Patriarchal Synod of the Armenians—is given in the Appendix.

against his policy, refused to give this uncompromising champion of a cause to which he had once admitted his adherence another chance of attacking him in the open.

Bishop Dupanloup not only abandoned Urquhart's cause himself, but drew away in his train one of his most ardent supporters, a personality even more picturesque than his own, the great leader of the Catholic Pan-Slavist movement, Bishop Strossmayer, who gave as a reason for his defection that the proclamation by the Council of such Decrees as were contained in the Postulatum, would prevent Austria from dismembering the Ottoman Empire.

"Mgr. Dupanloup," says Urquhart in a letter to Strossmayer, "gives as a reason for not defining the Law of Nations that such a definition would remain without effect.

"Mgr. Strossmayer gives as a reason that such a definition would prevent a great crime and a great misfortune to Europe and to the human race.

"In case your Lordship does not judge it opportune to allow me to discuss the matter with you, I take the liberty of adding here that if you should shed the last drop of your blood, as you declare yourself ready to do, for what you call the liberation of the Sclavonic race, such a sacrifice would only be made for its enslavement, since a successful result of such an undertaking will only reduce the Sclave populations of the Ottoman Empire to the condition of the Poles. . . . Pan-Slavism is nothing in the world but a Russian plot."

Urquhart's argument, however, proved unavailing. Strossmayer as well as Dupanloup refused to sign the Postulatum.

Day by day the cause gained fresh adherents, and to its success the Eastern bishops contributed not a little. The Romans could not say that they heard of the courtesy and dignity of Eastern manners only from a Turcophile Englishman. They were there before the eyes of all beholders. It was not from the lips of a Protestant layman that people heard that the Justice and Law which Christians had forgotten were to be found enthroned in the East, in the heart of a nation which they had all their lives despised. They were forced into contrasting with the suspicion and dislike

shown to the Council by European Governments, the courtesy and generosity of the Sultan, who had not only encouraged the bishops of the Eastern Rites to attend it, but had placed a warship at the disposal of those who wished to go. They could not but connect this respect for Law of the Mussulman with the support which had been given by the Turkish Government to the Decrees of the Armenian Synod assembled at Constantinople, calling for the restoration by the Holy See of Law between nation and nation. They could not fail to perceive that it was due to such support that the Eastern prelates had been able to do what the Western prelates could not, and set aside for the Council the maxim "Il ne faut pas sortir de la sacristie"—a maxim diametrically opposed to the claim which the Pope had put forth in the Syllabus, the claim of the Church to rule over the consciences of communities as well as over those of individual men.

The Eastern bishops, however, were not the only propagandists. As the days went by Urquhart's alert figure, with its brilliant blue eyes and soft, fair hair waving round his head like an aureole, became a familiar figure not only in the houses of prominent English laymen, but at the receptions of bishops and cardinals. Amongst his supporters he now counted, not only such enthusiastic friends as Mgr. Mermillod, the Bishop of Rodez, the Bishop of Nevers, but many a high ecclesiastic who, having first made his acquaintance in Rome, remained attached to him throughout the rest of his life.

There was an irresistible charm about him. He was youth incarnate, daring, fearless, capable alike of the keenest enjoyment and the deepest despair.

Père Roh,[1] the Jesuit, meeting him for the first time, says:

"C'est la franchise elle-même, la franchise poussée jusqu'à la grosièreté. Mais il n'est pas du tout entêté. C'est l'homme du monde qui se rend le plus facilement à la raison. Si on veut lui faire faire quelque chose ou ne

[1] Celebrated German Jesuit, Professor of Theology at Freiburg and Paderborn.

pas le faire on a seulement d'aller chez lui et lui dire les raisons, si toutefois on a des raisons à donner."

He captured whole sections of Roman society by taking away its breath. The first time he met Mgr. Franchi,[1] who afterwards became one of his closest friends, he said to him:

"You must accept what I have to say in all its apparent rudeness and extravagance. I am against everyone, I am a revolutionary in everything. You know well that all I propose is very ancient. But still in each case it is as regards the actual men a new discovery and is in opposition with all that exists."

Popular as he became, he cared nothing for his popularity save as it served the great cause. "Your father says," writes Mrs. Urquhart to her son, "that we are taking as much pains to save the world as most people do to get into Society, as it is called." Her diary is a record of busy days:

"*January 20th.*—Lord Stanley gave a dinner party of bishops and the Postulatum was signed.

"*January 24th.*—David went to Cardinal de Bonnechose's reception with the Bishop de Nevers. Very well received. All the bishops thanked him for what he had done.

"*January 26th.*—David at the Palazzo Bernini. Very useful. Bishop of Carcassonne.

"*January 31st.*—David saw Cardinal Pitra and Cardinal de Angelis. Delighted with Cardinal Pitra; more than hour with each.

"*February 1st.*—David in the evening to Cardinal de Lucca's reception. Bishops of Poitiers, Nevers, Mgr. Franchi, and the Comte de Bréda dined with us."

Not only did Urquhart thus get into touch with the great world of Rome, he was, so to speak, in its confidence. His transparent honesty, his innate nobility of soul established for him relationships which were never broken.

"Nous regardons M. Urquhart tout comme un évêque,"

[1] Mgr. Franchi was titular Archbishop of Thessalonica, Secretary of the Congregation of Ecclesiastical Affairs, and Consultor of Propaganda for the Affairs of the Oriental Rites, He had been appointed in 1867 Consulter of the Politico-Ecclesiastical Commission of the Congregation, which had general charge of the arrangements for the Council.

said a Western prelate to Mgr. Azarian.[1] "S'il est évêque," the other answered, "il est d'un Ordre à lui, car il n'y a pas d'autres."

"Non-obstant le secret," he writes to Rustem Bey, "je suis au courant de tout ce qui se passe."

On one occasion, whilst he was with the Cardinal de Bonnechose, the bishop of Moulins came in to talk official business. The Cardinal plunged into a discussion about the Council much to the surprise of the visitor, who became very reticent. "You may say anything," said the Cardinal. "M. Urquhart est un de nous."

The General of the Jesuits came himself to see Urquhart and discuss his proposal for a Diplomatic College, or at least for the training of men in "law, diplomacy and etiquette."

"The Father listened with great patience," said Urquhart, "and sustained attention, though he had just come from a fatiguing sitting of the Council. I hid from him nothing of my thought, either about the depth of ignorance that exists, or the fatal consequences of crime and infidelity which have followed it. I spoke of the part which the Church or modern ecclesiastics have had in the production of the disasters of the world, and the infidelity of men, and the suffering of Society by not fulfilling its duty as a teacher."

The interview resulted in the appointment of a small committee of ecclesiastics to consider the possibility of such a College.[2]

All this time, however, Urquhart was waiting for the goal of his desire—an audience with the Holy Father. It was a great thing to have gained the ear of these others; but after all he had come to see the Pope. There was a small but energetic party of men who, for various reasons, were against him. Some, like the Bishop of Orleans and Bishop Strossmayer, took their stand on motives of high political import; others objected to the interference of a Protestant layman in matters which they persuaded themselves concerned only Catholic ecclesiastics. Such was a certain French

[1] Vicar-General to Mgr. Hassoun, Patriarch of Constantinople.

[2] This scheme sprang from the suggestions in the "Appeal to the Pope."

priest who, in reply to Urquhart's remark that, the Oriental bishops not having yet arrived, he did not know for certain whether the Decrees were passed or not in their entirety, said, "But, of course, you as a Protestant and a layman could not have Decrees communicated to you." Urquhart answered him with the simplicity which was one of his greatest charms, "Mais c'est moi qui les ai rédigés."

But those who feared his methods and tried to reproduce at Rome, happily without success, the indifference with which his own country had treated the high ideals and strenuous work of a lifetime, were his most insidious opponents. Happily for him he had influential friends at Court. "I know," he wrote, "that within the last few days, four Cardinals have begged him to grant me the necessary time." Some of his most zealous English friends, moreover, had the ear of the Pope and could refute calumnies. Lord Denbigh had an excellent opportunity when the Holy Father, in reply to a suggestion that he would do well to see Urquhart, answered, "But they tell me he is of no consequence, that it is not worth seeing him, that no one in England listens to him. Il a écrit une brochure, n'est-ce-pas ?" By way of answer Lord Denbigh sent to the Pope a sketch of Urquhart's life as well as a small selection from his written works.

In spite of opposition Urquhart's friends at last prevailed, and on February 9th, 1870, he obtained his long-desired interview with the Pope. It was a private audience of the most friendly nature, and in it the Father of Christendom more than justified Urquhart's expectations.

"I arrived at the Vatican," he says, "on the greatest day of my life at twenty minutes to six. The audience was fixed for six, and I was admitted five minutes later. Having made my reverence as to an Eastern Sovereign with my two hands, he raised me up and made me sit in an armchair close to the one which he occupied himself. 'Enfin je vous vois,' he said, 'Dieu vous a inspiré les plus justes vues sur les plus grandes questions.'

"I had in my hand a copy of the Appeal in Latin and of the Canon Law in French, and said: 'Je dépose aux pieds de votre Sainteté et de votre Majesté l'appel que je

lui ai fait au nom du Droit foulé et de l'humanité abrutie.' He replied, 'Mais je l'ai lu, je l'ai ici' (placing his hand on the desk) 'et j'approuve tout ce qu'il contient.'"

Urquhart then presented to him the petition of the women of Macclesfield, mentioning to him that it had been signed by 400 of the women of Macclesfield in England.

"Que demandent-elles ?" said the Pope.

"La restauration du Droit des Gens," answered Urquhart

"Les femmes commencent à jouer un grand rôle," remarked the Pope.

After a pause Urquhart begged permission to read to the Pope twelve points[1] to which he wished to call his atten-

[1] The twelve points were given in French. This is, however, a translation of them from Mrs. Bishop's *Life of Mrs. Urquhart.*

"1. The power possessed by the Revolution has its origin in the fact that the Public Law of Nations, and consequently the Law of God, is neither comprehended nor applied in human societies.

"2. The Revolution is cunning, for it uses the veil of deceptive words, which lead honest men and even bishops astray.

"3. Russia uses Revolution as her instrument, and alone profits by its crimes.

"4. Your Holiness, who represents the conscience of mankind, is the only man who can re-establish Public Law.

"5. Hence it is that in the East it has been sought to lessen your authority, and that certain bishops have not understood that they are serving the purposes of the Revolution and of Russia.

"6. In the West we have been able to perceive that the whole debate between Law and Revolution is summed up in your authority. Thus at the Peace Congress at Geneva, which personified the struggle, there were but two parties to it—the Pope, defended by the Catholics and me; and Garibaldi, supported by Russia and the Revolutionary Party.

"7. It is for this reason that I have chosen Constantinople and Geneva as residences and posts for my observations, and I have come to Rome as the centre of Light, of Law, and of Respect.

"8. The Eastern bishops have been almost unanimous. The bishops of the West who have been the warmest defenders of this question of Public Law are Monsignor Manning, Monsignor Des Champs (Bishop of Malines), and Monsignor Mermillod, all three independent of Governments and diplomacy. All three they contend in behalf of justice in the cities which are centres of Revolution in the West—London, Brussels, and Geneva.

"9. The practical means is to profit by the Council.

"10. Obedience will return to men when ignorance is dispelled.

"11. For thirty years I have been solely devoted to this question and its issues.

"12. Support would be gained by the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the Porte, which would facilitate the reunion of the Christian populations of the East."

tion, and which he had written down in case he should forget any of them.

"I looked," he said, "to see if he showed any signs of fatigue, but it was with great interest that he observed my large sheet and he listened with unfailing attention to the end, only interrupting me to ask the meaning of some phrase or to signify his approval.

"When I had finished he remained for some time in silence, and then made sundry observations on the state of the world which I did not altogether catch, and which seemed to me to be interior reflections. Then he said, 'You have been some time in Rome?' I replied, 'I have been in Rome more than three months. I came here at a very great sacrifice in the hopes that your Holiness might under the circumstances be able to make some use of me 'à l'extérieur' and for the instruction of others in the present diplomatic conditions. My efforts up to the present have remained fruitless, but I have still a month which I can devote to your Holiness' service.'

"'You have travelled in Turkey?' said the Pope.

"'I took a considerable share in the affairs of Turkey at an age when most men are still at college. By the confidence of the Sultan Mahmoud and of his three successors I took part in the financial and military reconstruction of the kingdom and in interior and exterior politics. . . I was among them as one of themselves, and a late Grand Vizier remarked, 'Il est trois fois Turc.'"

In a few words Urquhart indicated the true inwardness of the relations between England and Turkey.

Then the Pope returned to the consideration of the twelve points, referring especially to his suggestion that diplomatic relations should be established between Rome and the Sublime Porte. The obstacles to such a proceeding, he said, would not arise in Rome, they would come from France. Neither did he see that such a Mission could be undertaken at that moment, "puisque nous sommes tous occupés tous les moments. Moi-même" . . . (and he raised his arms and bowed his head with a gesture of infinite weariness) "j'ai. . . ."

"I ventured to interrupt him," says Urquhart, "with 'Ce monde là ne doit pas faire beaucoup souffrir de telles épaules.'

" He looked at me fixedly, shaking his head, and I continued:

" ' Ces choses sont petites et sont pour les grands hommes. Les choses que j'ai à présenter sont de grandes choses. Pour elles il faut de petits hommes.'

" To this apparently enigmatical speech the Pope made no reply. He returned to the discussion of the Appeal and Urquhart's proposals for the restoration of the Law of Nations, and finished the conversation by saying solemnly, " Maintenant la première pierre est posée !"

" I will keep you ever," he continued, " in my memory. I will pray God to grant you that all may be well with you in this life, and I hope that the day will come in the next when in all things you and I may be at one."

Urquhart was entirely satisfied with his interview.

" The Pope," he said, " is extremely wise and shrewd, but at the same time very kind and fatherly."

" Le Pape," he writes to M. Le Play, " a justifié toutes mes anticipations; j'ai été aussi loin qu'il m'est possible d'aller. Pendant trois mois on m'a barré sa porte. Elle ne s'est ouverte à la fin que par une décision prise par lui-même. . . . J'ai trouvé ce que j'ai prévu: Le Pape et le Pape *seul !*"

Immediately after the interview the Pope appointed Mgr. Franchi (afterwards Cardinal Secretary of State to Leo XIII.) to be the intermediary between himself and Urquhart. Between the two men there sprang up a great degree of intimacy. In his intercourse with Mgr. Franchi Urquhart experienced the unusual joy of finding all his projects at once understood and appreciated. The day after the audience he unfolded to him in a three hours' conversation his long cherished schemes for the establishment of diplomatic relations between Rome and the East, and the foundation of an International Diplomatic College in Rome.

" Votre plan," said Franchi, " est aussi pratique que magnifique et nécessaire. Maintenant la première pierre est posée."

" C'est le Saint Père qui a dit cela à l'audience," said Urquhart. " C'est la *seconde* pierre qui vient d'être posée."

Two days later, "by the Pope's desire, Mgr. Franchi called upon David to consult him about the Regulations for the Council,"[1] says Mrs. Urquhart in her diary, "and asked him to write an article about them. He was here from eleven o'clock till one, and went minutely into all the regulations as they then existed, and mentioned the new ones to be made."

The same day the Postulatum *De re militari et bello*, signed by forty Conciliar Fathers, was presented to the Commission for consideration. Thus they had before them not only the Postulatum of the Armenian Synod, but one signed by a large and influential body of Western Bishops. Though it was sent in the name of the Fathers of the Council it was Urquhart's work, and everyone recognised it to be so.

"Up to the present," he says, in a letter to a friend in England, "no ecclesiastic and no Catholic has taken any leading part in the work. They speak to me of 'your Postulatum' and 'your business.' The Pope said to Mgr. Mermillod the other day, 'I hope Mr. Urquhart's work is progressing.'"

But though the work was his there were many who shared his joy in the success which had been obtained and his hope for the future. "À présent," said Mgr. Mermillod, "la semance est jettée, la neige peut venir; cela ne l'empêchera pas de pousser."

Obviously the audience and the Pope's evident consideration for the Protestant layman greatly increased his prestige. His name was on all the lists of official receptions. Cardinals eased their anxiety and refreshed themselves in the midst of their strenuous work and harried days by many a visit to the Via Sistina to discuss affairs with a man who always saw behind the scenes, who never took a commonplace view, and who never hesitated to strike a warning note when it might be of use."

"At five, Cardinal de Bonnechose," writes Mrs. Urquhart; "stayed till 6.30. Had just returned from the French

[1] Probably with a view to bringing them into line with contemporary parliamentary procedure.

Embassy. Much depressed and alarmed. Said the Council was now in a state of paralysis and seemed smitten with the impossibility of concluding anything. Blamed regulations and spoke of Governments, and ended by acknowledging that the Church might declare the Law."

The delay in the proceedings of the Council was giving much cause for alarm to those who were watching the war clouds gather on the horizon of Europe. Urquhart especially regarded it with increasing uneasiness, convinced as he was that it was engineered from without.

"You have just a breathing space," he said. "If you allow the opposition to go on so as to be able to do nothing else (than to pass the Decree of Infallibility) events will come which this Declaration as to war might prevent."

It may seem strange that a "rank outsider" like Urquhart should have been taken so far behind the scenes in Conciliar matters, but it was after all in keeping with his life and character. Even if men hated him they always instinctively trusted him. A curious incident mentioned in Mrs. Urquhart's diary shows how well that trust was merited now.

"At the Cardinal de Bonnechose's reception David went up to converse with the Archbishop of Westminster and one or two other bishops who were standing together. As he went he found himself considering how much he ought to tell them of what he knew of what was going on. A few days afterwards David met the Bishop of Rodez and asked him how the new regulations worked. 'I do not know,' the Bishop answered, 'whether, or how much, I can tell you of things in the Council.' David answered, 'The last time I saw you I was in the same state with regard to *you !*' "

Amidst all these absorbing new interests, or, to speak more correctly, new developments of interests, and new friends, Urquhart forgot neither old interests nor old friends. He was corresponding with Karl Marx on the financial position of Europe and the collusion between Governments and great financiers. He was in close touch with the Foreign Affairs Committees, who had just sent a petition to the

Pope[1] in which twenty Committees were represented. On February 19th, 1870, he wrote to the Chairman of the Macclesfield Committee:

"I have submitted to the Pope the Macclesfield Address through one of the chief functionaries. It was accompanied by an Italian translation, which the Pope himself read with great care. He then gave orders that it should be referred to the Commission of the Council with a particular recommendation from himself. The petition of the women of Macclesfield I presented myself. His Holiness was much struck by it. I am empowered to convey to them his thanks, and can also convey to them the assurance which I myself derived from the whole conversation that his own desires coincide with the tenor of the Petition.

"The Postulate representing the ideas contained in my Appeal to the Pope has now been either signed or approved of by all the prelates who have obtained the highest number of votes for the various deputations, as, for instance, the Archbishop of Saragossa, the Bishop of Paderborn (German), the Bishop of Jaen (Spain), the Archbishop of Tyre (Maronite), the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Jerusalem and Antioch, besides the Bishop of Geneva, the Archbishop of Westminster, etc., etc.

"The Oriental prelates have fully justified the expectations formed of them, and those belonging to the three principal rites — Armenians, Maronites and Melchites (Greeks)—have signed it. There are also many names of English and Irish bishops, and it is believed that the greater number will support the Proposition although they have not signed. Many bishops have made it a rule not to sign anything out of the Council.

"In giving you this intimation of so marvellous a result I have to acknowledge how far the Foreign Affairs Committees have contributed to it. Both by their addresses to Eastern prelates, their petitions to the Pope, and the deputation to the Sultan the grounds were laid for future action as regards both Candia and the Council. I enclose a facsimile of the Postulate as originally drawn up and signed by the Armenian prelates which has been deposited in my hands.

"I have to urge you to spare no pains in obtaining petitions. We are now assured of the concurrence of the Pope and the support of the most eminent members of the

[1] See Appendix.

Roman Hierarchy which has been given by their signatures. But still it is but a commencement that has been made, and an arduous and precarious struggle has to be gone through before really effective Decrees are passed, and the other collateral but not less imperative measures are adopted.

"You are at liberty to communicate confidentially this letter to the other Committees."

By the end of April Urquhart felt that all had been done that could be done. Besides his own appeal and the petitions from English working men and women, the Holy Father had received petitions from French Catholics, English Protestants, and English Catholics, the latter including a sketch of Defourny's *Œuvre Apostolique*, all alike urging on the Council the imperative necessity of once more declaring to the world the Law of Nations.

Before he left Rome he had the joy of knowing that the Postulata had been accepted by the Commission.

"Voilà la position," he writes to M. Le Play. "Les Décrets sur le Droit des Gens (je vous le confie sous le secret le plus absolu) sont rédigés et présentés unanimement par la Commission au Pape qui les a envoyés appuyés au Concile. . . . On m'a dit que le Pape en ouvrant le paquet de la Commission a dit 'Ah, nostro Urquhart.'"

Urquhart felt he could do no more by remaining on the spot. The month of service he had promised to His Holiness had lengthened out to three when he and his wife at last turned their backs on Rome. On May 31st, Mrs. Urquhart writes in her diary:

"Arrived at the châlet. Thank God!"

We can well imagine that the expression of gratitude was no empty phrase when we realise what it must have cost her to leave four children, one a baby of a year old, for six months to the care of servants, in a country not her own. Only once does she let us see a glimpse of what she felt. In March she wrote to her elder son:

"You say I will lose all Frankie's comic little ways. My dearest Daisy, you may be sure we would leave Rome

to-morrow if we could without doing wrong. The occasion is so great, it is one that cannot happen again, and what we are striving for is the honour of God and that the name of Jesus may no longer be put to shame by what men do who call themselves Christians. This has been the object of your father's whole life. . . . What would I not give to be able to see you and the girls and the little fellow if only for half an hour and give you all a good kiss !"

For a month Urquhart and his wife were able to enjoy their peaceful retreat and their reunion with their children.

Then the blow fell.

On July 18th the Council overcame the opposition and proclaimed the Dogma of the Papal Infallibility.

The next day it dispersed amid the first thunders of war, proposing to meet again in November. The day of meeting again never came.

The delay that Urquhart had known to be dangerous had proved fatal to the fulfilment of his hopes.

"Le delai était un crime," said Defourny. "Mais les criminels sont ceux qui du dedans ou du dehors suscitaient le delai."

But once again these criminals had proved too strong.

The Postulata over which Urquhart spent himself so freely still lie among the papers to come before the Council, though the hands that signed them are long since cold, and the tireless brain which conceived them has been for forty years at rest.

CHAPTER XV

THE LAST CHAPTER

"Lofty designs must close in like effects:
Loftily lying
Leave him—still loftier than the world suspects
Living and dying."

THE last chapter of David Urquhart's life, the story of the seven years of work which remained after the Vatican Council, is the most difficult of all to write, not from lack, but from superabundance, of material. So many were the threads he held in his hands—those hands which "ought to have been the hands of a sculptor"—threads of invention, threads of statecraft, threads of social reform, the dark and sinister threads of Russian intrigue and Prussian domination, mingled always with the golden strands of Faith and Hope! So rapidly did the swift shuttle of his thought dart backwards and forwards amongst them, making a pattern which, though it may have been clear to the great spirits, the Angels of the Presence who watch man's destiny, nevertheless dazzled the eyes and bewildered the minds of mortal onlookers!

It seems best, therefore, in trying to trace the story of those remaining years to follow the golden thread which was in fact his own guide, the thread of Hope that the salvation and regeneration of the world might still come through the Catholic Church.

When Urquhart withdrew from Rome his magnetic personality, he left behind him many traces of his presence.

On the day of his departure he entrusted to Mgr. Franchi a Memorandum of "four things to be done" which he was to submit to the Pope.

One of these was the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Sublime Porte, and another the appoint-

ment of the Abbé Defourny to the Diplomatic College, which was on the point, as it seemed, of being established. Urquhart had already drawn up for it a scheme of Education which the General of the Jesuits had approved. It was such a scheme as would have caused the conventional educationist to gasp with horror, and the European diplomatist to wag his head with scorn.

The neophyte was to be trained first in cleanliness, the real cleanliness of the Turkish bath; then in politeness, the real courtesy of the East, to be found in the West only in the ceremonial of the Catholic Church. These two un-Western practices would immediately "set up a barrier between him and the defiling and irreverent spirit of the Age."

Then would come the study of the Law of Nations; then the study of History, true History, not such as is taught in school or class book, nor that which has been miscalled History for the last three hundred years. Last of all the student would learn "Metaphysics," beginning with the study of words and their connection with thought and going on to the connection between thoughts and ideas in the minds of men and nations.

That this scheme was not carried out was due not to any idea among the authorities of its impracticability, but to the chaos into which Rome was thrown by the quick march of sinister events.

Rome, however, in the midst of all her woes did not forget the meteoric Englishman who had flashed across her skies. Three years after that memorable year of the Council, Cardinal Capalti, Prefect of the Congregation of Studies, spoke with the deepest feeling of "the good Mr. Urquhart had done" during the Council. "The seeds are sown," he said, "and will bear fruit."

"He was a great help to us during the Council," said Père Armellini. The Abbé Sangelgian spoke with tears in his eyes after Urquhart's death of the great work he had done and the astonishment which men had felt at the keenness of his prophetic vision. Long afterwards, in the days of stress which followed those calm months, men

remembered how he had warned them that the halcyon days of the Council would end in a storm.

"Je n'avais pas la claire vision comme vous," wrote the Bishop of Rodez shortly before his death, "mais je pensais que les jours de paix accordés au Concile par la Providence étaient comptés; c'est pourquoi j'étais si indigné des efforts de l'Opposition pour entraver nos délibérations dans un bût d'ajournement indéfini."

In those fateful days of 1870 how many men must have remembered his clear and confident prescience of them!

Everywhere confusion reigned. It was as though the very mention of Law had roused to fury all the demons of lawlessness, and had sent them ranging over the earth to do their utmost during the time that might remain to them.

The Patriarch Hassoun, who had come to the Council bearing the Vote of the Armenian Synod, had gone back to his Patriarchate to find himself face to face with serious trouble: not only was schism rending the Armenian Catholic body, but the Porte, in absolute contradiction of its hitherto unvarying policy, had sided with the dissidents and was persecuting the Catholics. So fierce became the storm that Hassoun, after vainly trying for a while to stem it, found himself driven into exile at Rome. He had become too dangerous to Russia, said Urquhart, since his action in the Synod, to be left at large in the East.[1]

The distressful state of the Armenian Catholics gave sad point to the mild rebuke of the Pope when he accepted Mgr. Dupanloup's submission to the Decrees of the Council "notwithstanding the harm you have done in the East."

[1] The dissidents placed themselves under the rule of the Civil Patriarch, John Kapelian, who was recognised by the Porte. The schism lasted till 1879, when Kapelian submitted to the Holy See. Hassoun and Azarian, who had found their exile in Rome very bitter, and whose letters to David Urquhart during that time would of themselves make an interesting volume of ecclesiastical history, were restored to their dignities. Hassoun was, however, in 1880 made the first Armenian Cardinal by Leo XIII, and returned to Rome under happier conditions. Azarian succeeded him in the Patriarchate.

See Urquhart's *Le Patriarch Hassoun*, written in 1873 for the French edition of the *Diplomatic Review*, for a full account of the schism and its connection with the Council.

To the Church in France even the immense catastrophe of the war had not brought internal peace. Gallicanism, though its wings were clipped, still survived. The internal submission of many of the Bishops was not so generous and entire as that of the Bishop of Orleans: they remained "absolutists," and on their return from the Council the parish clergy underwent in many cases a species of persecution at their hands.

The Abbé Defourny even during the Council had warned Urquhart that because of this spirit among the Bishops a Papal Proclamation of the Law of Nations would of itself be of little avail in France.

"It will be of no use," he said, "for the Pope in the Council to define anything, however clearly he does it, if the mode of its application is left to the judgment of the Bishops. The Gallicans among them will toss aside, skilfully and boldly, rules of discipline, unless those rules are rigid, unless all the i's are dotted."

His own Bishop had threatened to "break him" on his return from the Council because he had written a treatise on the dangers of Gallicanism. For years he was kept in a state of "esclavage," and was not allowed to publish anything, not even to write a letter to a newspaper under his own name.

In the Papal States, in spite of many promises and professions to the contrary, convents and monasteries were being emptied of nuns and monks.

Rome itself was filled with an undisciplined mob which had been brought thither to swell the Plebiscite, and was given over to licence.

"There have been orgies here," writes Mr. Monteith from Rome, at Christmastide, 1870, "not unlike those once performed in Paris. Things impossible at Florence or Turin are put on the stage here. The songs one sees hawked about are awful. The insecurity is very great. Very many people live entirely within-doors. The delivery of bread has been irregular from the necessity of guarding it, two or three stout fellows armed with sticks not always proving sufficient. The address of the new Rector of the Roman College has done some good, for it was distinctly atheistic.

In fact the reaction and disillusionment is remarkable. De Rossi told me a good deal. An acquaintance of his who carried the banner of the so-called P—— of the Leonine City to the Campidoglio came to him the other day with open remorse, exclaiming that he would now ' gladly invite the Turks to drive out the Italians.' "

But at the Vatican itself all was different. It was " like a house of pilgrimage," said Monteith. Pius IX. was full of sweetness and courage and " forgiveness," and the cardinals, who dared not be seen in their official dress in the streets, but who " came to the Vatican in shabby vehicles, covered with old black cloaks and changed in the Ante-Camera," took their tone from him. Monteith could not speak without tears of his Christmas audience with the Pope, nor of the sorrow and desolation of that Christmas-time in the Eternal City, where no Midnight Masses were said and no " cannon sounded at dawn from Sant Angelo." " Perhaps," he said, " they will never be heard again during our time."

The Temporal Power had gone, the Papal States had gone; the Pope was no longer a temporal Sovereign, his Government equal in rank, by the Law of Nations, to the Government of any Power in Europe. He was a prisoner in the Vatican, not knowing from day to day what might befall.

The time when as a Sovereign Power he could protest against the ill-doings of his fellow Sovereigns was gone by, frittered away by a " delay which was a crime."

What, then, was left ? Urquhart, whose disappointment at the fatal blow had been more bitter than that of anyone else, said that everything that mattered was left.

" The power which resides in the Pope is not so much as touched by the crimes of the Duke of Savoy and the King of Sardinia."

He absolutely refused to admit that the high hopes he had built on the Papacy had come to nothing. His belief in the Pope was unbounded.

" The Pope has done everything well—no less and no more than he ought to have done."

He refused to admit that anything had gone whose loss was irreparable or even material. The Temporal Power had gone; let it go: perhaps all the Sovereignties in the world would go.

"We are," he said, "perhaps but one step nearer to reality by its going. The Catholic Community still exists; with knowledge and science it will be irresistible, all the more irresistible because it has at last realised, or it has at least such an opportunity as it never had before of realising, what it has to do and what to fight.

"Christianity rose into the world out of the Catacombs. Its path was in blood, its own blood. So may it be with the second Resurrection of Christianity."

If men cared enough for Liberty and Justice that second Resurrection was assured beyond a doubt. But did they? On the answer to that question must depend the future of the Church, whether it would sink into paganism or would live.

So he took up again the office of teacher which he had hoped to have left at the Council for ever in the hands of the Church.

"I do it," he said to one who thought he took too much upon himself, "for the same reason for which I have worked all my life, because there is no one else to do it." "Si ceux que vous appelez croyants et Catholiques comprenaient et faisaient leur devoir," he wrote to Père Roh, "il y aurait présomption de ma part d'ouvrir la bouche."

Because there was no one else to do it, both by voice and pen he tried to supply the lack. Much of what he wrote at this time is more concise and more vigorous than any of his earlier work. Of his English writing perhaps the best specimen is the *Four Wars of the French Revolution*. Like a good deal of his work it is reminiscent, and his reminiscences are like the survey of a traveller looking from a mountain height over the country he has painfully and toilsomely traversed.

He wrote much in French; it was indeed in French that he wrote one of his most outstanding works, *La Désolation de la Chrétienté*. It made a great impression. Of it M. Le Play said:—

"J'ai lu et je relis avec une satisfaction que je ne saurais vous exprimer *La Désolation de la Chrétienté*. Vous avez réussi beaucoup mieux que dans vos autres ouvrages à exprimer votre pensée; cette pensée devient chaque jour plus nette et je crois remarquer que vous avez été mieux servi par la langue de Descartes que vous ne l'avez été par votre langue maternelle."

The *Désolation* was a short treatise which embodied for the rest of the world the teaching he had mapped out for the Diplomatic College. Its keynote is: "Ce que l'Européen modern croit est probablement faux, et ce qu'il dit impossible est la chose à tenter et à accomplir par un cœur droit."[1]

The plan of the work is something like this: In the mind of the modern European right and wrong have changed places. Society is upside down. Thought is completely *bouleversé*. Men pride themselves upon having grasped the deep truths of life and religion when they have merely got hold of a few catchwords which they think stand for them.

The human mind is so constituted that it is dependent on language as a vehicle for ideas; hence the great necessity for guarding the purity and accuracy of language. But in Europe, and particularly in England, language has become vague, and loose, and full of hybrid, abstract words; it is unfit for the conveyance of accurate and sound thought.

Such a condition of language makes it impossible for a man to perceive its harm to himself since it cuts him off from accurate and coherent thought and thereby from clear mental sight. There is one way to overcome this, and only one, and that is by learning a language still unspoilt. Such a language Urquhart found in Turkish. Nothing showed him more clearly the meaninglessness of European abstract ideas than an attempt to render them intelligible to a Turk in his own language.

Language, however, is not the only means of communication between human beings; another and one not less

[1] The text which was given him by the rose in his garden! See Chapter XI.

potent for good or evil is to be found in a man's bearing towards his fellows, which is speech in action. Ill-bearing means loss of dignity, familiarity, insolence; it is the language of injustice, want of love, selfishness, cruelty and in the last resort, murder, bloodshed, and wars of conquest and rapine.

A right bearing or courtesy means that a man retains his own dignity and respects that of others; it is the language of love and justice, of national and international Peace, Law and Liberty.

The "free and easy" manners of Europeans are bad because they are built either on insincerity or on want of honour and of dignity. In European countries the Catholic Church alone inculcates real courtesy. Does anyone in England ever see a schoolboy bow as he stands aside for his father to pass or as he hands his mother some article of domestic use? Yet he does both as he serves the priest in the sanctuary. Urquhart saw the Eastern boy in his home perform the simplest acts with the courtesy of a prince, and he nearly wept with joy when he recognised, in the action of a young man kissing the foot of the Pope's statue in a Catholic Church and laying on it his forehead, the "temena" or greeting which he had so often seen in the East given by the young to their elders.

It is on these two things, spoken language and the bearing of men to each other, Urquhart maintained, that human society rests.

The desolation of Christianity lies in this, that in Christian countries these two bases are crumbling away. They lay four square beneath it in the past. They were the stability of the ancient kingdoms of the East. To them Turk and Persian, Japanese, Chinese, and other ancient civilisations owe their extraordinary tenacity of life. Such nations Urquhart was not afraid to hold up for an example to Christians, as a greater than he, he said, was not afraid to hold up the heathen as an example to the religious people of His own time.

Modern Society is rotten and crumbling away because it is based on rotten and false foundations instead of the true

and solid foundations of earlier times. It is for the Catholic Church not to pride herself upon her superiority to pagans, but to learn lessons of them where she can, and boldly to point out to the world its evils and the true reasons for them, its false thought and the immoral actions which spring from it. Of these evils the greatest is War, modern War, which is murder.

War in ancient days, terrible and devastating as it was, was like one of the forces of Nature; it came like an earthquake, without hurt to the moral nature of man, and it came from without, from the conquest of some mighty king, from the invasion of barbarian or savage; it was not, as it is to-day, the result of internal degeneration.

Nations go to war to-day, not to punish wrong-doing, not even to make a larger place for themselves when their own becomes too strait. It is in fact no longer the nation that goes to war; it is a small party in the nation which, for its own advantage, careless of others' good, heedless of the rights of all, sets the mighty ball a-rolling.[1] And men have ceased to respect the goods of other men and the rights of other nations because they first ceased to respect the human dignity of others, because for respect is substituted familiarity, for courtesy if not rudeness, at least "free and easy manners."

With that loss of respect, of courtesy, of human dignity, has come the drawing apart of Society into classes, so that now men live side by side as strangers, without respect, without consideration, not to speak of love, for one another.

"An English writer of the last century," says Urquhart, "Mr. Cobbett, remarked that the change for the worse in England took place when farm labourers no longer sat down at the table of their masters. I would go further and say that decadence began when the vassal and the serf no longer ate at the table of the lord. Once when I was at such a table in the East, with a Prince and a Patriarch at one end and a beggar at the other, I ordered my English servant to seat himself down too. He refused, giving as

[1] See Arthur Penty, *Guilds and the Social Crisis*, where he ascribes the Great War of 1914 to the rottenness of the economic condition of the whole world—particularly of Germany.

his reason that he could not serve a master whom he could not respect, and he could not respect me if he sat down to table with me. Whereupon I sent him away, and I hope he took his place in his own rank.

"If that man had kissed my hand after dinner he would not have ceased to respect his master for dining with him; indeed, so to have dined would have increased both his respect and his affection."

When Society is based on mutual respect there will be revolt against wrong, but not Revolution, as Revolution is understood in Europe to-day. If their rulers break the Law men will enforce it against them, but the Law once enforced, they will revert to old relationship. They will not say, "Our King is a tyrant, we will have a Republic." They will say, "Our King breaks the Law; it is for us to see that he observes it."

More than this and they would be themselves law-breakers.

The modern State was in no way Urquhart's idea of what a State should be under the rule of the Catholic Church. She could only be content with it if she ignored both her heritage and her mission. It would only be in a State where Truth and Respect once more reigned that she could rise to her full stature of dignity and beauty. It would only be when all the world consisted of such States that her work for the world would be done.

The Church could not go about preaching dogmatic theology in season and out of season in such a world as then existed, but she could, like John the Baptist, cry aloud "It is not lawful," when right was outraged and wrong was triumphant. There she had a weapon both against judicial perversion and religious infidelity.

Such is, in brief, the theme of *La Désolation de la Chrétienté*. It was much appreciated by Catholics everywhere. The Pope sent, through the Archbishop of Westminster, a brief, thanking Urquhart for it.

"David Urquhart, Protestant de nom et Catholique de doctrine," says the author of a work on the Council in quoting a long passage from it in his Preface.

"C'est le fait d'un honnête homme," says Père Roh,[1] "qui nous aime et qui nous estime."

"Monsieur Urquhart," said the Bishop of Geneva, speaking to the Pope of the book, "nous prépare une atmosphère à travers de laquelle la lumière peut se faire jour."

And His Holiness answered: "L'aurore viendra."

"Je constate," said M. Le Play, "de plus en plus que nous venons l'un et l'autre de l'Orient. C'est là notre parenté. C'est ce qui fait que beaucoup de gens nous appellent 'rétrogrades.' Le fait est vrai et l'appélation juste. Seulement ce qui est dans leur esprit une critique doit être un éloge."

The writing of the book and the reception which it received revived in Urquhart all the old courage and fire which the fiasco of the Council had damped. They were indeed needed, for the political situation, though not hopeless, was desperate.

The letters of his friend Baron Prokesch,[2] Austrian Ambassador in Constantinople, grew more and more depressing.

The Porte, which had hitherto preserved much of its Eastern character, was fast becoming entangled in European politics, and Turkey, thanks to the introduction of European financial methods, was on the verge of bankruptcy.

[1] Père Roh wrote of it to Mrs. Urquhart:

"MANNHEIM,
"27 *Mars*, 1871.

"MADAME,

"Quoique je sois bien occupé j'ai achevé la lecture très attentive de l'admirable travail de M. votre mari. C'est un ouvrage que je re-lirai et que je méditerai souvent. J'éprouve un profond regret et une profonde humiliation d'être arrivé à l'âge de soixante ans ignorant tant de choses si nécessaires et si simples, après tant d'études. Si j'avais su tout cela, il y a 30–40 ans mon action en classes et à l'église eut été tout autre. C'est bien tard pour moi que de commencer, mais ce n'est pas trop tard pour bien d'autres, et je ferai mon possible, afin qu'ils fassent mieux que moi. Je m'appliquerai a faire connaitre en Allemagne cette admirable brochure, et je vous supplie de lui procurer de votre part la plus grande publicité possible."

[2] Urquhart had been intimate with Baron Prokesch through the whole of his varied political career. In 1839 he was Minister Plenipotentiary at Athens, in 1852 he was President of the Germanic Diet at Frankfort. His Memoirs are full of interest, showing how deeply he shared Urquhart's feelings on the Russian question.

One ray of hope he saw. His desire for the opening of diplomatic relations between Rome and the Sublime Porte had been fulfilled by the despatch of Mgr. Franchi to Constantinople as Papal Envoy, to try and disentangle the knot of the Armenian schism. His negotiations were, up to a certain point, successful, and the danger of rupture which would have been disastrous to Catholics in the Ottoman Empire was averted.[1]

It is curious to read from the letters of this time that it was to the Grand Vizier, Aali Pasha, that the Comte de Bréda betook himself after the disastrous defeat of Sedan with the proposition that Turkey should help to bring about a combination of the weaker States in a *Ligue des Faibles* against the haughtiness and insolence of the great

[1] Mgr. Franchi wrote to Urquhart from Constantinople:

"J'ai reçu avec un grand plaisir votre aimable lettre du 12 courant, et je vous remercie des bienveillantes paroles que vous avez voulu exprimer à mon égard. Du moment que j'ai été nommé par le Saint Père pour remplir cette importante mission à Constantinople, j'ai pensé tout de suite à votre honorable personne. J'étais très sûr que vous en auriez éprouvé une joie tout particulière et que vous m'auriez accompagné avec vos voeux s'il vous n'était pas possible de me faire une visite. Oh! comme tout ce qui se passe ici me rappelle les discours que nous avons faits tant de fois sur l'Orient et sur les grands intérêts de la religion Catholique!

"Je crois, mon ami, que ma mission a fait quelque chose de bien. L'accord avec la Porte est presqu' à sa fin. La participation des laïques dans l'élection des Évêques est admise dans le sens que vous aviez indiqué, c'est à dire au bon témoignage sur les qualités des candidats. Des autres points sont arrêtés sur les garanties de la fidélité relativement aux élus à la dignité épiscopale, à l'administration des biens, conservation des rites et des liturgies, etc. De sorte que j'espère d'avoir tout fini dans le courant du mois prochain. J'ai assisté hier soir au dîner donné par le Grand Vizir dans l'occasion de l'anniversaire de l'avènement au trône du Sultan, et j'étais placé à la droite de Mehmed Kiupresti Pacha, qui m'a dit d'avoir reçu votre lettre, et qui m'a promis de m'envoyer la brochure de laquelle vous me parlez.

"Nous parlons toujours de vous avec le Baron de Prokesch et nous nous rapellons toujours vos grands services rendus en général à la société, et en particulier à la Turquie. Pour ce qui concerne ma personne je suis très content d'avoir visité l'Orient, et je suis convaincu que si nous aurions eu une idée plus exacte des Mussulmans et de leurs intérêts nous aurions pu en profiter d'avantage.

"Je vous prie de présenter mes compliments à votre femme, et d'agréer en même temps l'assurance de ma haute estime et la considération avec laquelle je suis votre devoué ami.

"(Signé) ALEXANDRE,
"Archevêque de Thessalonique."

États-Dieu of Prussia and Russia. The Grand Vizier was so impressed with his visit, and apparently so much interested in the scheme, that it was the talk of all Constantinople how he had kept waiting for twenty minutes the Sheikh-ul-Islam, who was announced during their interview!

England was rejoicing over the victory of Prussia, but Urquhart knew it, and proclaimed it to be a disaster for the world. In spite of his hearty contempt for and dislike of Louis Napoleon, he was absolutely convinced that the whole war had been engineered by Prussia, at the instigation, and with the co-operation, of Russia. A declaration of the Law of Nations by the Council might have prevented it, not only because of the effect it would have had on the German Catholic party, but because the only thing which Russia feared was the establishment of Law and Order on a footing which promised permanence. That hope was as yet unfulfilled, but it was Urquhart's goal in all his future work.

"The Pope, when he said 'I can do nothing unless I am moved from without,' gave me," he was wont to say, "my mission—to be always on guard, that when the opportunity for action comes I may seize it for him."

For that opportunity he never ceased to watch. He threw himself into any work that might bear within it seeds of hope, were it the *Œuvre Apostolique* of the Abbé Defourny, or the *Union de la Paix Sociale* of Le Play.

The *Œuvre Apostolique* was a religious society which he had directly inspired, though he did not altogether approve of the form it had taken. The Abbé Defourny and Père Jullion were its two promoters. Its basis was a purely religious one, and its aim was to re-establish courtesy in the family and justice in the State.

It was another and practical method of "preparing the occasion" for the Pope. Defourny was convinced that it would be of no use even were the Pope to proclaim the Law of Nations from the Vatican unless the Church both desired that Law and was prepared both in spirit and in knowledge to carry it out. It was to quicken the spirit

and supply the knowledge by instruction both to children and their elders that the *Œuvre Apostolique* was founded. It met at first with much opposition from the ecclesiastical authorities, and its final approval by the Holy See was due to Urquhart himself. When Defourny went to Rome in 1875 for the Jubilee, Urquhart gave him a letter to his old friend, Mgr., now Cardinal, Franchi, begging his good offices for the *Œuvre* with the Holy Father. So successful were those offices that Defourny returned from Rome with great joy, his work approved and an open course before him.

Of another nature was the *Union de la Paix Sociale* of M. Le Play. It was, as its name indicates, an association to promote internal union within the French nation. But M. Le Play was too much one in mind with Urquhart not to see that International Justice was the only basis of such union. Therefore the re-establishment of the Law of Nations took the first place in the work of the *Union de la Paix Sociale.*

Le Play had collected around him many disciples who thus became familiar with Urquhart and his work, and his sphere of influence steadily widened in France. Learned societies like those of Arras and Lille and Grenoble, asked for monographs from himself and Defourny, whose reputation as a Canonist had steadily grown through years of plodding work.

Père Ramière introduced him to a section of the most thoughtful and learned Catholic public at the time, by writing four articles on the "Restauration du Droit des Gens" in *The Etudes,* the French Jesuit Review of which he was afterwards editor. The articles are a complete exposition of Urquhart's work. The author describes enthusiastically the "écoles du Droit des Gens," as he calls the Foreign Affairs Committees, and is most sympathetic and far-sighted in the view he takes of Urquhart's life and plans and visions for the future. This is the more creditable to his large-mindedness because he was one of those many Catholics who could not understand the position of a man so thoroughly at one as Urquhart was with Catholic

morality who yet held aloof from the Catholic Church. Urquhart must indeed have been a mystery to many of the devout Catholics he numbered among his friends. They saw his overwhelming faith in the Church and the deep truth and rectitude of his character and said: "This man is not far from the Kingdom of Heaven; a few more steps will see him there." And they were grievously disappointed when those few more steps were never taken.

There were others, however, who seemed to have realised that God was leading on His servant by ways they knew not. So they were silent. The Holy Father never spoke a word to him of conversion. And of the Pope Urquhart said: "C'est lui dont le concours m'est le plus nécessaire."

It was as though between them there was a deep and unspoken bond.

So with regard to others, and these some of those most eminent Catholic ecclesiastics. They were never troubled about Urquhart's non-adherence to the Church. Probably the saintly Père Aymond expressed their feelings when he said, "A man must be a man before he is a Christian."

To some, however, Urquhart's position was a stumbling-block. "When they find that you do not adhere to the Church," said Père Ramière, "the Catholics who now believe in your work will forsake you."

He, like many others, never understood how small a part intellectual assent to dogma had in Urquhart's scheme of religion. That which to them was most important seemed to him quite secondary. In spite of Jeremy Bentham's influence on his early life, intellectual truth was to him only a part of truth. Moral truth was that by which men lived and the world would be saved. No dogmatic truth was of value to him unless it could be translated into action, and action of a kind which the world needed. Therefore those in whose eyes intellectual assent to the Faith was so important as to obscure the value of moral assent failed altogether or in part to understand him. Catholics, however, on the whole misunderstood him less than most other religious people. For to a Catholic, as to Urquhart, salvation without works was impossible.

The point of divergence lay in the position assigned to works; Urquhart put them first.

He said, "Let the child be taught respect and courtesy, let the man realise the rights and dignity of his fellow-men, let the nations be made up of such men as this and they will be in a position to be Christians and Catholics. At present they cannot be either. 'If any man will do the will of God he shall know of the doctrine.'"

Many Catholics said, "Let the nations come back to God and the Church and they will know how to treat their brethren."

But he answered, "Catholics and Protestants are alike in their disregard of Law and Justice. 'If a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?'" A barren faith will plunge the world into a darker infidelity than it knows now. But Justice will lead men towards the Light. He pointed to men whom the Foreign Affairs Committees had rescued from secularism and atheism; to Singleton, for instance, the quondam leader of a Secularist Society who, in spite of everything against him, had lately become a Catholic.

There is no doubt but that Urquhart grew more and more convinced that the Catholic Church was the only body in the world where religion was to be found, and that, had he been convinced of the necessity of adhering to any religious community, he would have become a Catholic; but of this he never was convinced. Absolute Justice was the only sheer moral necessity in the world, according to the vision of his youth. Those who had not seen the vision could not see what he followed.

Urquhart's last and not least important step to translate his truth into action was his endeavour to put before France the idea of a National Tribunal, or Council, for determining causes of war. His idea was that, as in the best days of Rome, Justice was safeguarded by placing in the hands of the College of Fetiales the right of decision in questions involving peace and war, so in the Europe of his day such decision should be taken out of the hands of the Bureaucracies which modern Governments had become, and entrusted to a body of men which should be able to judge

as impartially as a civil tribunal in cases of civil crime. For war is only justifiable if it is the judicial carrying out of a judicial sentence. He proposed this idea to the French Assembly, thinking that France, suffering as she was from the war in which she had just been engaged, might count some among her statesmen who could see the advantage of this proposal. The proposal, though it was initiated by himself, was introduced by a Deputation from the English Working Men's Committees to the French Assembly, through one of its Commissions on the state of the working classes. The Duc de Pasquier was in the Chair, and the Deputation was introduced by M. Le Play, a French Deputy, M. Lucien Brun, and the Abbé Defourny. The Comte d'Harcourt acted as interpreter.

"The remarkable thing was," says Mrs. Urquhart, "that at first the French Deputies could not understand what it was all about. They imagined that the Deputation were workmen come to state their grievances as working men. They insisted on asking them if they had not something to say about their wages, their hours of work, savings banks, etc. . . . It was only, as one after another got up, and spoke almost with indignation at the idea that they were only occupied with class interests, that the notion of something else dawned upon the minds of the French gentlemen. Then they wanted to put the idea of a Tribunal for war aside, saying: 'It is a grand idea, but it has nothing to say to our objects.' On this, the men spoke again, and one, David Rule, in particular, most effectually, and told them that, while they spoke not as working men, solely, and not as forming a class with different interests from the rest of the nation, that what they desired to effect did concern them and all working men in all countries most deeply, and that while the great and general causes of suffering, of crime, of discontent and disorder existed, it would be useless for them to be occupied in small palliatives which did not touch the true sources.

"After that the Petitions were accepted to be presented to the Assembly.

"You can understand the interest to us of these men doing so well after the interval of years in which David has not seen any of them. M. Le Play went down to Versailles with them. He has now undertaken to work up the subject."

The substance of the Petition presented by the Deputation was that the Assembly "would establish in such a manner as shall seem best a Tribunal without whose sanction no war shall be declared and no treaty ratified, the nature of which shall be rendered independent of all political interference and influence, by the manner and lasting nature of its appointment."

So bitter was the feeling that had been aroused in France, however, by the callousness of England during the Franco-German War, that the Assembly was not disposed to receive favourably any English suggestion. The whole proceeding, moreover, was so unique, so contrary to anything they had been accustomed to connect with the spirit and motives of the working men, and they were so unprepared for the incident, that they were quite unable to deal with it. The action of Urquhart and the Committees, however, bore fruit later when the Society of Jurisconsultes of Arras made, in 1873, a similar and more detailed proposal to the Assembly, on the same lines.

Urquhart, in the hope of being supported by the French nation, as a whole, had laid a scheme before all the Bishops urging on them that, if the Church took it up, it would immensely strengthen the hands of the Pope when the world was once more in a sufficiently peaceful state to allow the proclamation of the Law of Nations to be considered by the Council.

"God grant," wrote Mgr. Franchi, from Constantinople, "that the great ones of the earth may listen to you. The Address to the Assembly will be a great step towards the restoration of Justice and Charity."

The idea, however, was intensely unpopular in France, and both Russia and Prussia were on the alert to prevent any return to a reign of Law and Order. Every attempt was made to hinder Urquhart's propaganda.

"The enemy is very sharp," he writes to Lord Denbigh. "The copies of the Address have all been stopped in the French Post Office. They are now being sent out again from Geneva by private hands. Also the little pamphlet *Besoin d'un Tribunal pour la Guerre* has been stopped. A

member of the Swiss Government has come to Lausanne to stop my letters in the *Gazette*. The Russian Minister is at work with and on each person that I gain here. I am troubled and stopped at every point."

In France, even in the minds of pious Catholics, there was room for nothing but thoughts of revenge.

"Your theories are admirable," said more than one of those whom he addressed. "We are entirely at one with them; let us first be avenged on Germany and then we will consider the question of the Law of Nations."

One of the most devout of laymen, the Comte de Bréda, wrote declining to have anything to do with the Petition:

"Il n'y a, il ne peut y avoir en France aujourd'hui qu'un seul désire, reprendre le guerre dès qu'on pourra. Ce n'est pas à nous qu'il faut parler de paix maintenant. . . . Je livrerais sans hésiter la France au premier caporal venu, si c'était certain qu'il nous ménerait à la destruction de l'Allemagne. . . . Je ne connais pas une femme qui ne destine son fils à tuer un jour les Allemands. . . . Si toutes les Puissances Européennes s'unisaient pour détruire la Prusse et l'Italie elles ne feraient que se mettre au service du Droit."

Such a state of mind was incomprehensible to Urquhart.

"As for your wishes for the destruction of Germany," he said, "I have no right to judge as a Catholic, but as a citizen and as a man I *can* judge, and my judgment is that such a wish is altogether irreconcilable with either of the two characters, and the reading of the Fathers of the Church would lead me to the like conclusion."

The Comte de Bréda supported his wish for the destruction of Germany by saying that it was Protestantism, and particularly German Protestantism, which was responsible for the state of the world—not, as Urquhart had been all his life preaching, "the neglect of the Law of God."

Urquhart answered:

"There is no excuse for a Catholic comparing himself with a Protestant, except to find out wherein he might take example from him. I can see no difference between the public conduct of Protestants and Catholics. Both are alike oblivious of the Law of God in public affairs. Only,

Catholics have never repudiated, as Protestants have, the right of the Church to give the law to the State.

"The world is in a bad way because of the want of religion, it is true, but the evil is due to the failure of the Catholic Church to fulfil her duty.

"La Science des choses divines ne trouve son application que dans la Science des choses humaines."

"To get the world out of its present tangle a man must be a diplomatist and a metaphysician; but at the root he must be a religious man, and, if possible, a man with a religious authority. He must be able to do what I have been trying all my life in vain to do. A bishop, hearing me speak once, said, 'Est-ce possible que de telles paroles tombent d'une bouche qui n'est pas Catholique ?'

"I answered, 'The pity is that such words do not fall from the lips of any Catholic.' "

What stirred him to the depths was his conviction that, if Catholic bishops could be thoroughly convinced of the absolute necessity, not only for intellectual assent to the truth of what he said, but morally convinced that it was their duty to act on the world, a great part of the work would be done.

"A bishop," he wrote to Père Ramière, "with the Pope over him, with a diocese under him, with the power to issue Pastorals, to instruct the young to influence individual souls in the confessional and the whole Church wherein to make his voice heard, what might he not do !"

"What a difference between us as to our estimate of the Catholic Church ! It is not a question of the number of steps you can make with me, but of those which you do not make at all, and which you cannot make because you believe the Church to be powerless."

Urquhart's belief in the power of the Church was unlimited. Hence his bitter disappointment when, as he thought, her failure to act promptly and strenuously meant to the world that what she alone could do remained undone. What baffled him to the end of his days was why a body which possessed boundless power should, as he thought, fail to exert it.

But though her exertions could have accomplished so much and his so little, that was no reason for relaxing effort.

He toiled without break, without intermission, even when in the last years of his life he was almost too weak to hold his pen, to raise his voice. Now he was in Paris, now in the northern towns of England, urging the Foreign Affairs Committees to resist the representation of England at the Congress of Brussels, and again at the châlet, trying to gather round him men who might carry on his work. "For," writes Mrs. Urquhart, in 1876, to a promising English pupil, "he begins to grow old, and there is no one to take his place."

The *Diplomatic Review* still owed its existence to his constant exertions, and he had a great share in the founding and maintaining of the *Rome*, a French Catholic newspaper published in Rome, which was yet another of his means of "preparing the occasion" for the Pope.

In 1875 he paid his last visit to the Committees, speaking with all his old energetic force. His speech to the Keighley Committee is the best and clearest resumé that he ever gave of the history of the Chartist Movement and the origin and work of the Committees.

But he had completely dropped out of English political life.

His last years were touched with sorrow and disappointment. He saw his friends fall off one by one, some silenced by the hand of death, some overpowered by weariness or taken prisoner by the spirit of the world and chained within its stronghold. But he yielded neither to outward pressure nor inward weariness. Even on his last journey, the voyage which he took to the East in a vain effort to revive the strength which was at last all spent, his brain and his hand never ceased to work.

He died at Naples on his way home from Egypt on May 17th, 1877. In his portfolio, after his death, was found, amongst other unfinished papers, the copy of a letter he had written to a friend:

"You speak to me of the religion of the Church, and you say that the object for which I work is a detail, though you grant a very important one. I work to make men see sin where they do not now see it.

"When Las Casas worked for the same object, do you know what he answered when men asked him why he worked so hard? He said, 'I have left Jesus Christ, your Saviour, crucified, not once, but a thousand times by the Spaniards, in the person of the Indian Nations.'

"Here it is not the Spaniards and some Indian tribes at the other side of the world, it is all of us who are murderers and victims, who crucify and are crucified."

The words come like a noble melody wherein all the apparent discords of the life are resolved into a great harmony. The disappointments, the human mistakes, the misunderstandings, the sorrows, the irritations, the anxieties which had worn down his strength until the last day of racking pain came to end the strife, are but incidents in the heroic story of that life of gigantic effort—that life of thought in action before which Death sinks into insignificance.

Among the tributes paid after his death to Urquhart's memory none is more touching than this letter by one of his working-men friends to the *Herald*:

"Sir,—Most of the London daily newspapers and many of the provincial daily papers and others have had lengthy notices upon the death of the above-named gentleman. Those who have read them will think that they have read something about him. Beyond learning the fact of his death, however, I think that the readers would know less of him than they knew before. At any rate, if they were ignorant of Mr. Urquhart's work and aims before, they would not be enlightened after, on anything except upon his endeavours to establish the practice of Turkish bathing. Perhaps we don't need to be surprised at this. A wise man is seldom known in his own generation. It is only necessary to mention the case of the great Founder of Christianity, who was reviled and spat upon and crucified by the men of His generation; or of Socrates, who was poisoned publicly by the men of his own country; or the case of our own Shakespeare and Milton, who were little known and appreciated in their own day and generation. It has been for history and men unborn at the time to reveal in after times the greatness and glory of their characters. I am not anxious to anticipate history or to try to write history. All human actions either are or will be reckoned

at their right value. The law of compensation is a law of God, and it invariably squares matters to a hair's breadth. I may, however, be permitted to say a few words about this great, self-sacrificing man, having known him twenty years, having listened to his words many long hours, having had considerable correspondence with him, and having read nearly all his written works. It is of such knowledge of him that I am able to say that such newspaper notices of his death as I have seen give no account of him at all, and contain no truth in regard to him. Whoever these newspaper remarks may apply to, I am quite certain that they do not apply to him. Prior to a period when I came to know him, in 1857, I had been a Feargus O'Connor's man, an admirer of G. W. M. Reynolds, a disciple of Joseph Barker, and a general grumbler against all the institutions of the country, and a rabid advocate in my little way for change and extreme reforms. I did not know the value of law, and I did not respect it. My condition was the condition of thousands—perhaps of millions—of my fellow-countrymen, as it is the condition of many now, but I do not think to as great an extent. Mr. Urquhart has changed many, and they, in their turn, have changed others. When I knew him at first, his labours were then directed to the most extreme men—Atheists, Chartists, extreme Radicals. He went from town to town, all over England, to find them. He who might have sat at home in luxurious apartments, taking his ease, like thousands of the rich at this day, turned out into the crowded cities and towns, and sought out all the active men amongst the working classes, so that he might converse with them, and deal with the fallacies and errors that were in them When men asked him, 'Will you help us to get votes?' he said, 'I will help you to get knowledge of your country and its concerns, so that if the vote be of any value it will come to you, instead of your spending all your days to try to get it.' When men asked him, 'Will you help us to get the ballot?' he said, 'Have you not secrecy enough? You have secret diplomacy, great affairs of State conducted in whispers. Well, you clamour to have secrecy in voting instead of spending your time and energy in endeavouring to abolish secrecy in international transactions.' He was successful to a very great extent amongst the active men of the working classes, and I have heard him say over and over again that some of the best workers and the most heroic and patriotic men have been gathered from amongst the active revolutionary

men of the working classes. They have turned out to be far more earnest defenders of the Constitution than the great mass of those who have been brought up religiously, and who have been taught ordinarily to respect the Constitution. The men that he has picked up from the former class were used to work—they were fighters naturally. Mr. Urquhart's success with them has been to give a new direction to their energies, to direct them to fight for the restoration and preservation of the Constitution, in place of fighting against it. He visited Preston many times, sometimes for the purpose of talking for hours to two or three working men. On two occasions I managed to get the late Canon Parr and him together. Whatever some have said about the late vicar, he was unquestionably a man of a wonderful understanding and an earnest patriot. He could understand and appreciate him. He used to say to me what the Earl of Denbigh afterwards said in the House of Lords, 'Mr. Urquhart is the Cassandra of this age.' The vicar understood with very little effort all the matters that Mr. Urquhart endeavoured to teach us—such as the right of search, the hollowness of the Crimean War, the necessity for the restoration of the Privy Council, the schemes of Russia, the value of the House of Lords, the Treaty of Denmark, making over the Crown of Denmark to Russia, and many other questions. The vicar has gone to rest, and I hope from the bottom of my soul that he is in heaven. I am afraid that we may never get another minister of the Established Church to listen to us and help us as he did.

"One lesson that Mr. Urquhart impressed upon all his disciples perhaps more than any other was that man can form no conception of his own capacity. He does not know what he can do, or, rather, what he can't do. That every separate man should always work as if the saving of his nation depended upon his own efforts alone. He impressed upon them that it was not their business to be elated by success, or cast down by failure; that it was quite as glorious for a good man to fail in any matter as it was to succeed, always providing he had done his best, and left nothing undone that it was possible for him to do; that God never required a man to do more nor less than his duty.

"Mr. Urquhart seemed to care most and look most after the intelligent and well-meaning amongst the working classes. He used to say that they were the easiest to change. They were simple, humble, and without pride. They had nothing to lose, in a social sense, by change.

They had not an array of rich acquaintances or a lot of customers to please; their poverty made them independent He said that Christ was most successful among working men, with here and there a rich, influential man to lead them, and what happened in His day would always happen with everyone who sought to recover righteousness amongst men. Working men would take the lead, and the middle and higher classes would fall in without looking singular. Mr. Urquhart has been called an 'extreme man,' and an extreme man he unquestionably was, to all intents and purposes. Not for anything in life would he tell less or more than the truth, for which alone he 'lived and breathed and had his being.' His language ever came burning and bursting fresh from his soul. His denunciation of inattention to public affairs and want of patriotism was terrible to the last degree, and it extended to all who were guilty of it. Men of rank, the greatest in the land, were dealt with as mercilessly as others, even more so. Justice and truth and right he loved above all things, and whoever went against them he warred with without stint and without abatement. Those who worked for them were his friends. He would have gone miles to see one of them, even if he was a beggar, and to him he would have given the very bread from his mouth. During his long, laborious, and most enthusiastic life he has been variously estimated by various men. Some have called him a Mohammedan, some a Catholic, some a Russian spy, some a friend to despotism, and some have called him a madman. Each of these in his blind classification of Mr. Urquhart has seen his own thought, but has not seen one glimpse of the man, Mr. Urquhart, any more than the writers in the London dailies. The measure of the charge as to his being a Mohammedan is simply and only that he wished justice to be done to Turkey, justice as laid down and prescribed by the Law of Nations, that law which is founded and grounded on the unvarying law of God, which always remains, even although erring nations may break it ten thousand times. The charge of his being a Catholic is true to the extent that he has looked on Catholics as human beings having a great organisation professedly untrammelled by obedience to the potentates of the earth, except in so far as that obedience did not entail the committing of public crime. As he had laboured amongst the dignitaries of his own Church, and as he laboured amongst revolutionary bodies to get both to see that inattention to public affairs was

a crime, that unjust war was murder, and that secrecy in international affairs was a standing incentive to corruption, so did he try to reach the great Catholic organisation by appealing to its dignitaries, reminding them of their own canons, and impressing them with the necessity of condemning public crime, so that they might not put obedience to the potentates of the earth before that obedience which all Christian communities first owe to God. This he laboured long and unceasingly to teach all men that he could reach. He never ceased to teach it day and night. For this his health, time, and money were spent without stint. For this he spent thousands of pounds of his own money while often he lived on twopence a day. I am getting an old man. From my boyhood upwards I have seen and heard many public men, and I have read of many others, but it has never yet fallen to my lot to know or to learn of such an instance of pure, unsullied, unselfish patriotism—so great, so earnest, and so fearless a teacher of public duty, who entered into his work with an undivided soul, never tiring, never weary, always fresh, and always earnest to the last degree. I have seen him put important matters aside when three factory lads have presented themselves at the hotel where he had been staying, and for six hours I have heard him address them in earnest and impassioned language on public matters, showing them their duty in relation to them. Many public men have lived to make a jingle or a sound, to catch the ephemeral applause of the multitude and the fine eyes of many, but Mr. Urquhart sought out the thinkers and men who had a passion for justice. He sought to make men who could do their own work instead of being tied to the tail of a leader. He succeeded far beyond his expectations. He has left a number behind him who mourn his loss with real sorrow, and who will honour his memory in the one way which, above all others, will gladden his soul if he can look down upon them, and that is by practising those lessons of public duty which it was the great aim of his precious life to teach them so often and so well.

"Hoping that you will insert this poor attempt at giving a very faint glimpse of the late Mr. Urquhart,

"I am,

"Yours, etc.,

"WILLIAM SINGLETON."

This epitaph, composed by the Abbé Defourny, was set over Urquhart's grave at Clarens, near Montreux:

SIT NOMEN JESU

BENEDICTUM

IN MEMORIAM

DAVID URQUHART

APUD BRAELANGWELL IN SCOTIA

ORTI A.D. 1805

NEAPOLI DEFUNCTI A.D. 1877

VIR

SUMMO INGENIO INVICTA CONSTANTIA

VIXIT LABORAVIT

PRISCAE REVERENTIAE INTER HOMINES

RESTITUTOR

NEFANDAE TRADITIONIS POLITICAE

VINDEX

JURIS GENTIUM

MAXIME VERO BELLI PACISQUE

TANTUM HOC ÆVO NON DELETI

PROPUGNATOR

APPENDIX I

SOME DETAILS OF MAJOR POORE'S LAND SCHEME AS SUCCESSFULLY WORKED AT WINTERSLOW

With reference to the question of the working of the land scheme at Winterslow, it was known that some of the men would like to have some land of their own; they had already tried renting a little land in the neighbourhood, but it had not been a success.

Major Poore felt that the lack of success of small holdings was due to faulty administration; he therefore started a scheme to show how a system of small holders can be securely and permanently established on the land by the action and knowledge of the men themselves, quite independent of, and unhampered by, any outside aid or interference, injuring no one, not adding a farthing to the rates, and carrying with it automatic means for its own success and endurance.

In the year 1892 a farm happened to be for sale in the neighbourhood, and in consultation with the committee of the village (which had already been instituted by Major Poore as part of his organisation of his County Council division) was bought at public auction, at about £10 an acre, with money borrowed from the bank, Major Poore acting as security.

Notice was given to the village that anyone requiring land might apply to the village committee, whose meetings were held in the schoolroom or Oddfellows' Hall, where applications for land were gone into.

Forty-seven people wished to take holdings, consisting of woodmen, carriers, shopkeepers, agricultural labourers, blacksmith, builder, postmaster, postman, roadmen, pensioners from H.M. Service, truffle-hunters, hay-trussers, keeper, schoolmaster.

Men who had worked on the farm were then employed to value the different portions; some they priced at £8 an acre, and some at as much as £30.

As this was the first venture, Major Poore had it revalued by a professional valuer, who expressed his opinion that the men's valuation could not be improved upon.

The farm was divided into five sections, and these sections were again divided into small holdings, as required by the

applicants. The largest holding was 16 acres and the smallest ¼ of an acre, with an average of 2 acres

To deal with the management of the land, these forty-seven men were formed into groups of about ten neighbours; each group chose its own chairman and vice-chairman, who formed the "Land Court," presided over by Major Poore. The chairman is permanent, the vice is appointed from a rota of the section and holds office for one year.

The Land Court then proceeded to administer the scheme, and it was decided that a fair but enhanced price was to be put upon the land, and that the average price was to be £15 an acre.

A Table was drawn up on the basis of fifteen years' purchase, whereby the capital and interest would be paid off, until at the end of fifteen years the man would become the owner. As a matter of fact, the debt to the bank was paid off in 1894; this was partly owing to some of the holders paying for their holdings right out. All further payments, after paying working expenses, went to build up a reserve fund.

The payment took fifteen years to complete, Major Poore holding the mortgage until all was paid up. . . . The sum borrowed for the purchase was repaid, and the surplus, which amounted to about £600, was formed into a reserve fund for the credit of the Land Court.

The method of administering the reserve fund is for a holder wishing to borrow to have a meeting of his section called; he lays his needs before them, also the security he has to offer, and if his section, from their knowledge of the man and his security, considers the proposition sound (one of the conditions being that the loan must not exceed 75½ per cent. of the value of the security offered), they agree, at the next meeting of the Land Court, to advance the mortgage loan. The chairman of the section lays the facts before the court, saying his section recommends it, and if the court approves it, the advance is made.

The result of this system is that the reserve fund, which has been of enormous benefit to these men, has now more than doubled, and their property has greatly increased in value.

The institution of the Land Court gives the small holder full responsibility, and a direct and sole interest in the land he holds, and at the same time sets up a common or mutual interest which, while preserving the personal interest, teaches the judicial method of bringing every mind into unison for the common benefit.

The whole of this organisation has been run without creating any disputes or ill-feeling among the members, and on such good business lines that, though, of course, he gave much time and thought to it, it cost the organiser nothing, and greatly benefited these men, keeping for them their entire self-respect, as there has been no outside aid or subscription of any sort, and in no respect has it been a matter of politics.

The principal object has been to form a common interest which will encourage individual effort and at the same time show an easy method of united action for mutual trade purposes.

There was no initial advantage in the farm purchased; the land was naturally poor, and, besides, was in a starved condition when it was taken, and the water-supply was bad. It is six miles from the nearest market town and four miles from the nearest station.

Not a single holder has regretted his purchase or his work, and husband, wife and children all co-operate to get the most out of the land. A large number keep fowls, and there is a well-supported pig club. The land is now in a highly cultivated state, producing all that small holdings are capable of; the water-supply has been arranged, and the houses are most comfortable, with convenient outhouses, and, above all, there is the pride of ownership; "This is my own land, every penny paid for, and this is my own house."

A neighbouring farmer, a practical agriculturist, who was much prejudiced against small holdings, has completely changed his views on the subject since this venture was inaugurated, and now takes the greatest interest in its success, as he considers that at least ten times more is being got out of the land than was previously obtained.

These men, mostly Wiltshire labourers, at 16s. a week or less, have paid for their land, and are now owners.

They have built for themselves about forty very comfortable cottages.

The land by their efforts has greatly increased in value.

There have been no disputes or ill-feeling.

The venture has added nothing to the rates, but has added considerably to the rateable value.

There is a surplus of over £1,500 for the Land Court to apply for its betterment and extension.

The Land Court also deals with all questions as they arise, collects the rates, tithes, etc., and pays them over as they become due, and after twenty-five years the books show few alterations of names, though in some instances the land has been transferred to the sons of the original holders.

The administration of the Land Court is the application to a modern scheme of the Old English common law (common sense) which separates all administration into two distinct procedures:

1. To inquire into the facts of the case by the men of the locality, the neighbours on the spot, and to balance such facts to the point that no man can deny in the presence of his neighbour.

2. To judge for action on such means for decision. If such precautions are taken, judgment will not err.

There is, and has been, no voting, no deciding by a majority, there being nothing to vote about when the facts are agreed upon. A fundamental principle of the Land Court is that each man must carefully master the facts of the case before a decision is given, thereby training the holders carefully to consider their actions, both in court and private life, without giving rise to jealousies or party feeling—once again proving the fact that if you organise a body of men so that they may be capable of judicial responsibility they will act accordingly. No money has been wasted on the payment of clerks or officials. The only salary paid is £5 a year to the village schoolmaster, who acts as secretary in his spare time.

The following account was written by Mr. Alfred Goodere, Editor of the *Salisbury Times*, in 1907. It is partly an abstract of notes which had appeared from time to time in the local papers, and partly the result of his own observations, for he had known the Land Court from the beginning:

1890.—The condition of Winterslow was this: A village, eight miles from the city of Salisbury, large area, scattered population, usual concomitants of rural life—big farms, a few small holdings. Population working in the woods, labourers on the land, with the ordinary tradesmen—bakers, grocers, blacksmiths, etc. Many of the inhabitants housed in thatched cottages, with small windows, few rooms; in some cases congestion, unhealthy to the moral and physical well-being of the occupiers. Fairly active public spirit in evidence, but the only forms of corporate life besides the religious organisations were a lodge of Oddfellows, a tent of Rechabites, and the administration of pig clubs and a cricket club.

1892.—A meeting in the village schoolroom. Present, about thirty men, respectably attired, keenly alert; in the chair a gentleman who is the representative of the Whiteparish Division, including Winterslow, on the Wiltshire County Council. They are met to discuss the affairs of village life, and to consider a project which has been laid before them by Major Poore. It is a Parish Council without the name, and on a more directly representative basis than any Parish Council I have known. The topic before the meeting is the division of a farm into small holdings, to be bought outright on a system of deferred payment. Free discussion and outspoken opinions about the advantages likely to accrue from peasant proprietorship; also an appreciation of the difficulties which may have to be surmounted. In earnest, the men eventually decide to make a trial to participate in a scheme fraught with great possibilities in regard to the landless man and the manless land and the possession of more comfortable dwellings.

1895.—Another visit to Winterslow. The ideas of three years ago have matured. A farm of 118 acres has been divided into lots, and is now in the possession of nearly fifty families. About

ten houses have been erected or are in course of completion, and as a townsman I go round, talk with the men and women about their venture. Ready to communicate, I find them contented with their bargains. Fairly optimistic, they do not gush; they are face to face with difficulties, the grappling with which may make or break them. The land was in a starved condition when they took it, and they have by their own industry and by their own capital put nearly every bit of value that is now in it. A few, having little hordes of savings, have already paid the purchase money for their holdings. The majority have paid for the first two years' instalments, and have to look forward thirteen years before they can confidently say: "This plot of ground is my very own."

Tuesday, March 12, 1907.—Work in the West Riding of Yorkshire and in the Midlands has prevented a revisit to Winterslow until to-day. Giving the sum, deferring the circumstance, this is what I find: Thirty-seven houses on about 118 acres; the land in a highly cultivated state, producing all that small holdings are capable of; and the total product at least ten times greater than that which had been produced fifteen years before. All the holders, with one single exception, have paid every penny of the purchase money, and can now say: "This is mine." Many can add: "And this is my own house."

The Genesis.

Let me now give the genesis of this transformation. The personal element must be subordinated, but, as it means an important factor, it cannot be eliminated. Three miles away from Winterslow is a gentleman's house, Old Lodge, owned by Major Poore and Mrs. Poore. Major Poore, by the way, is the father of Major R. M. Poore, 7th Hussars, of Hampshire cricket fame.

When the County Council Act came into operation in Wiltshire, Major Poore, who had during the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny served in the 8th Hussars, was asked to stand as a candidate for the Whiteparish Division, which includes Winterslow. As in most other countries, the initial contests were partly political, and believing that Major Poore belonged to the Conservative party, he was opposed by a Whiteparish carrier of strong Liberal sympathies and a good deal of native eloquence. It was soon seen, however, that Major Poore was not a party politician, and that his candidature was not under the ægis of Tory or Radical Association. He was returned for the division with a large majority, and the man who had been his opponent became one of his warmest supporters. Parish Councils were then being talked about, but had not been formed. Winterslow being the nearest village to Old Lodge, Major and Mrs. Poore took a kindly interest in the welfare of the community. For

years Major Poore had been a close student of history, and had a succinct knowledge of the old common law of England. In considering the decadence of rural life by the gradual absorption of the yeoman class, he was convinced that the system of government had had not a little to do with the partial loss of the small holder and proprietor. Our local government was too much on a machine pattern, and, necessarily failing to educe the knowledge and judgment of those living in the neighbourhoods and those acquainted with the facts of the localities, had to be administered by paid officials and members who often knew nothing (except under hard-and-fast conditions) of the circumstances under which they so readily passed resolutions. Under the old common law local government, he found, was based from the bottom.

1. The family corporate.
2. Ten heads of families, the frankpledge.
3. Ten heads of frankpledge, the tything.
4. Ten heads of hundreds meeting in four quarters, the shire.
6. The administrative heads of the shires, the country.
7. From this the Privy Council, a standing body of the General Assembly.

} To the King.

The frankpledge, according to Major Poore's reading, consisted of a group of the heads of the families; the tything of ten heads of frankpledges; the hundred of a group of the heads of the tything; the council of heads of the hundreds that went to make the shire. This gave a ladder of direct representation from the bottom to the top, and collated the evidence and experience of every householder, from the household to the frankpledge, from the frankpledge to the hundred, from the hundred to the shire, and from the shire to the country and to the King, as the personification of the nation. Was it possible in Winterslow to resuscitate something of the old frankpledge system? At all events, the Major would try. He set to work to explain his views to the most intelligent men of the village; the ideas gradually leavened the villagers, and at last the time was ripe for a meeting. Old as was the idea, it appeared absolutely new; yet a shrewd instinct convinced the villagers that a form of representation upon such a basis might be of real value. The population consisted of 786 people, representing about 200 families. Heads of households were divided into groups of ten; each group was called upon to hold a meeting and to appoint its chairman and vice-chairman. Meetings were held and chairman and vice-chairman appointed. The chairmen of the sections became what may be termed the executive committee of the village. They held frequent meetings, with Major Poore as

chairman, and sometimes with the friendly presence of Alderman Lovibond, of Salisbury, a member of the well-known firm of London and provincial brewers. Organised village in embryo—what would be evolved ?

In 1912 the Duchess of Hamilton wrote (*May* 30, 1912) to the *Daily Mail :*

"If you will permit the space, I would like to add my quota to the striving voices of those who are endeavouring to help the nation to reach a better state of things than the hopeless tangle which exists at present.

"A great deal of talk is heard about the troubles of the workingman—he who must needs be the rock base of all government, but who at present has no voice in it; and it is said that he is discontented for such reasons as the following:

"1. Because he does work which is dry and uninteresting.
"2. That he is misrepresented.
"3. That his wages are not high enough (he should, according to some, have at least £2 a week).

"I do not propose to enter into the first of these, as the differences new industrial forces have brought to the conditions of labour are great. My own opinion on the matter is that had every workman a personal interest in the success of the whole business for which he is working, as in the old guild organisation, the question of work being dry would not arise.

"In regard to the second, this seems to be just where the whole trouble lies. No man of the working class is really represented as he should be in Parliament.

"We call ourselves a democratic government, and some of us think we have continually improved our method of government, whereas the truth is we now completely waste the millions of intellects which should form, as they did in that ancient form of government, the Witenagemot, the base of a firm rock of government.

"The Witenagemot, or gathering of wits, may best be described as a gigantic pyramid of government, the base of which was the heads of every family in the kingdom, and the apex the King.

"This system was arrived at by a series of committees, whose numbers are not larger than about ten members.

"Those at the base of this emblematic pyramid were composed of about ten neighbours, heads of their respective families, who lived in juxtaposition to each other. These were called the 'frankpledge'; each of these committees chose a leading man or chairman, and these chairmen formed the next committee, which was called the 'tything.' The chairman of the tything formed the committee of hundred, and so on till the committee of the Privy Council, in whom were concentrated the minds of the whole people of the country.

"Of course, the change back to true representation would take some time and would have to be done locally by people of the district who grasped the spirit of this administration. In a small way it has been done with complete success by Major Poore, who in 1889 represented a district in Wiltshire on the County Council. He employed this system to organise each village in his district, and whenever there were matters of importance before the County Council he called a meeting of the chairmen of the villages to meet him and laid the matters before them. In their turn they returned to their villages, and were able, by calling a committee of the village, whose members in their turn called one of the tything, and so on, to lay the local matters before every man in the villages.

"At the next meeting the committee of village chairmen were able to give Major Poore valuable advice on each matter by the light of the collected intelligence of their villages.

"This form of government, once set going, would entail nothing like the expense of the present one, for there would be far more economy in spending the public funds, each district being responsible for its own concerns.

"The present stress of living, falling on the poorest, is often lamented, but with the enormous taxation under which the country groans, how can it well be otherwise? For, with all the assertions to the contrary, it is really the poor who have to bear life's financial burdens.

"The third cause of discontent I have named is that of wages. In order to demonstrate that prosperity of living has little to do with actual wage, but all to do with method and administration, I will explain an experiment in small holdings carried out by Major Poore in the village of Winterslow, near Salisbury, and which was the outcome of the previously described administration.

"In 1892, having, as already described, formed a committee of the village, he bought a small farm at an average price of £10 per acre; this he had revalued by the local village surveyors at an average price of £15. A notice was given in the village that anyone requiring land might apply for it to the village committee. Forty-five men applied for and took up the land. These forty-five men were then divided into committees of about ten, according to their locality, and the chairman of these committees formed the Land Court Committee, which was presided over by Major Poore. To facilitate transfer, the land was leased to the men for 2,000 years. The payment took fifteen years to complete, and is all paid up now. The sum borrowed for the purchase was repaid, and the surplus formed into a reserve fund for the credit of the Land Court. This reserve fund can be borrowed by any member of the Land Court, provided all the other members consent, but must be paid back with interest.

"It can only be taken out altogether and used for an object

which will benefit, not the greater number, but every member of the Land Court. I would now draw my moral, which is this—that these Wiltshire labourers, with a weekly wage of not more (some less) than 16s. per week, have—

"1. Paid for their leases.
"2. Built about thirty-seven new cottages.
"3. Have a reserve fund which has reached the sum of £1,450.

"Also, the organiser, Major Poore, has run the whole thing without creating dispute among members, and on such good business lines that though, of course, he has given much time to it, he has not lost a penny himself, and has greatly benefited these men—keeping for them, at the same time, their entire self-respect. Moreover, he has had no State aid or subscriptions, and in no respect has this experiment been a matter of politics.

"NOTE.—*Witena* is the genitive of wit, wisdom; *gemots* means gathering."

Winterslow was not the only Land Court founded by Major Poore.

In 1894 he bought another farm at Bishopstone, six miles the other side of Salisbury. This was a strip of 200 acres extending four miles, and most unpromising; the cost was about the same as at Winslow. However, on calling a meeting of the village, they appeared ready to take up the land, and it was bought and turned out a success. A local newspaper gave the following account of the dinner given by the landholders to Major Poore, on Tuesday, April 12, 1910, soon after the final payments had been made:

"Mr. Barter, as spokesman for the landholders, said: 'Fifteen years ago you made your appearance in Bishopstone, and I don't think anyone has regretted the day you came. The small holders are very thankful to you for what you have done for them. When we were prosperous no one was more glad to hear it than you; when we had a difficult year you were always ready with advice and help.

"'We therefore wish to present you with an Address, in the name of the small holders, and no doubt it will be handed down to your children and grandchildren.'

"Mr. Barter then handed to Major Poore an illuminated Address, which was in the following terms:

"'*To Major Poore, of Old Lodge, Wilts.*

"'We, the undersigned, members of the Bishopstone Landholders' Court, desire to record the deep sense of our gratitude to you as one of the pioneers of the System of Small Holdings,

for having by your energy and true devotion to the well-being of the parishes in the country districts of Wiltshire, in the face of many difficulties and at the expenditure of much time and personal trouble, enabled us to achieve such a successful result. It is now fifteen years since the Bishopstone Land Court was first inaugurated. Those years have not been free from anxieties and difficulties for us, but we have been assisted by your ready help and sympathy, and now at length have emerged triumphant —the last payments having been made—as freeholders, and we can take our place amongst those who have a substantial stake in the well-being of the country.'"

APPENDIX II

THE TRAINING OF THE COMMITTEES

Conversation of a Committeeman with a Fellow-Workman; sent to Mr. Urquhart for Criticism

Patriotism

Friend. Garibaldi did not murder people; he slew them in fair fight.

Committeeman. So did Kidd the pirate, but they hanged him for all that; and why shouldn't Garibaldi be hanged ?

F. He wasn't a pirate.

C. It was your word not ten minutes ago; and, moreover, your assertion is supported by international law.

F. If international law calls such acts as Garibaldi's piracy, then international law is bad, and ought to be repealed.

C. I knew you were coming to that. Did you ever tumble off a house-roof ?

F. No.

C. Did you ever see anyone meet with an accident ?

F. Yes; I saw a slater.

C. Was he killed ?

F. Yes.

C. What killed him ?

F. Why, the fall killed him.

C. What caused him to fall ?

F. He lost his balance.

C. What made him lose his balance ?

F. What irrelevant questions you put !

C. Patience, and answer my question: What caused him to lose his balance ?

F. I don't know.

C. Did you ever hear of Sir Isaac Newton ?

F. Do you think I am an ignoramus? Of course I have heard of him.

C. Do you recollect the famous anecdote of his seeing an apple fall?

F. Of course.

C. What discovery did he deduce from the apple's fall?

F. The law of gravitation.

C. It was, then, the law of gravitation which brought the apple to the ground, after the tendril by which it hung was no longer strong enough to counteract the operation of that law?

F. Decidedly so.

C. Then, when your slater made a false step, the law of gravitation not only made him lose his balance, but brought him to the ground?

F. Yes, in that way of putting it.

C. That's the right way, I humbly submit; but we won't go into that at present. I have now to ask you whether it was not the law of gravitation which killed your slater?

F. Decidedly.

C. Then I should say the law of gravitation was bad for that man, and those who depend on his labour.

F. Certainly.

C. Did they ask for the repeal of the law of gravitation?

F. I shan't sit here to be made a fool of. How could they demand the repeal of a law of nature?

C. You, by demanding the repeal of international law, are as reasonable as they would be if they clamoured for the repeal of the law of gravitation.

F. Ah! but the law of nations is not the law of nature.

C. Did you ever hear of Vattel?

F. Yes.

C. Who was he?

F. A writer on international law, I believe.

C. A great authority on that subject?

F. I understand so.

C. Deferred to by all the statesmen of Europe who respected international law?

F. I have always imagined so.

C. Then it is probable his definition of the law of nations is the correct one?

F. Perhaps it is.

C. I presume you will believe me when I tell you what that definition was?

F. Oh yes.

C. He says the law of nations is simply the precepts of the laws of nature applied to States. If then, you accept this definition as the correct one, knowing as you do that the laws

of nature are immutable, it must be plain to you that the law of nations is equally incapable of change.

F. Well, I'll not admit that altogether. Could the community of nations not agree to pass over without punishment such acts as Garibaldi's, when done with disinterested motives ?

C. Do you believe in the Ten Commandments ?

F. I do.

C. The Sixth says, "Thou shalt do no murder," and the Eighth, "Thou shalt not steal." Now, if the community of nations agreed to pass unpunished the crimes forbidden in these Commandments, would that resolution repeal the Law of our Maker, or exempt the criminals from punishment hereafter ?

F. God forbid !

C. Then, if such is your conviction, how could you put such a frivolous question with regard to the law of nations ? If they agreed to pass unpunished the crime of piracy, their depraved resolution would not repeal the law of nations; they would simply cease to respect it, and would in the end reap their reward.

F. Well, you have certainly made a great impression on me, but I find it hard to reconcile myself to the idea of punishing Garibaldi. He seems such a true patriot.

C. There you go again. What do you mean by a true patriot ?

F. Oh, I can easily define that. One who loves his country, and would sacrifice his life for it.

C. Of what province of the kingdom of Sardinia was Garibaldi a native ?

F. Nice.

C. Does Nice belong to Sardinia now ?

F. No; it was annexed to France.

C. Sold, in fact ?

F. Yes; it was a disgraceful affair.

C. Did Garibaldi take up arms against his monarch for destroying the independence of his native land ?

F. Well, no.

C. Then, why on earth call him a patriot ?

F. Now, look here: I am not going to the witness-box again, so good-night.

(*The Free Press, May* 1, 1861.)

APPENDIX III

I

POSTULATUM B.: ARGUMENTUM DE RE MILITARI ET BELLO

Quum in hisce luctuosissimis temporibus, sicut in diebus Noe, diminutæ sint veritates a filiis hominum, et multi jam non regnum Dei et justitiam ejus, sed quæ sua sunt, quærant, videre est et imprimis in iis quæ ad Rem Militarem spectant, omnem æquitatem conculcari et omnia jura permisceri. Itaque, dum quidam hac tristi rerum conditione commoti, sed non secundum scientiam sanctam sentientes, somniant tempus futurum quo homines, licet Deum non secuturi, non tamen amplius ulla bella videbunt, alii e contra bella quæcumque, vel potius strages et homicidia magna et horribilia reputant licita; ita ut et nocendi cupiditas, et ulciscendi crudelitas, impacatus atque implacabilis animus, feritas rebellandi, libido dominandi, et si qua similia, non jam culpentur in bello. Hinc illæ immensæ multitudines et exercitus perpetuo armatarum nationum, quasi perpetuo inter se hostilia parantium. Compertum igitur habemus et eos qui bella jubent aut parant, et eos quibus hæc jubentur, non jam amplius imperare et obedire juste, sicut præcipit ordo naturalis, sed oblitos esse aut parvi pendere hoc grave et quidem inter homines gravissimum mandatum Domini, olim per Moysen servum suum dicentis: Non occides. Haud minus oblivioni vel despectui dederunt et antiqua dicta Sanctorum Patrum, et præscripta Conciliorum a Sancta Sede probatorum, necnon et ipsorum summorum Pontificum documenta atque judicia, quibus constat nunquam in Ecclesia sancta Dei damnabiles non fuisse habitos tanti præcepti in hac parte transgressores. . . .

Capitulum Primum.

De Solemnitatibus Belli.

Jus Gentium circa Rem Militarem et Bellum ante omnia requirit Solemne Belli. Hinc bellum injustum est, ac proinde homicidiis et latrociniis plenum, quod non ex edicto et prædicto geritur, id est quod non fuerit ante omnia parti adversæ indictum ac publice denuntiatum. Denuntiatione autem belli intelligitur gravaminum objectorum publica declaratio, cum legitimæ et competentis reparationis aut satisfactionis petitione, parti adversæ per legatos solemniter facta. Indictionis vero nomine intelligere fas est edictum quasi judiciarium quo publice denuntiantur belli causæ, simul ac partis adversæ contumacia.

Dominus enim in veteri Testamento jussit populo suo dicens: "Si quando accesseris ad expugnandam civitatem," et agebatur etiam de civitatibus ab ipso Domino rejectis et damnatis,— "offeres ei primum pacem;" et legitur in libro Judicum filios Israel misisse nuntios ad omnem tribum Benjamin, ut traderent viros de Gabaa ad satisfaciendum injuriæ illatæ, antequam bellum inferrent. Quicumque igitur sive princeps, sive dux aut miles aut alius bellum suscipere aut in eo participare, hisce omissis solemnitatibus, præsumpserit, se sciat mortaliter peccare, et quidem in genere homicidii, tanquam auctorem vel complicem in solidum omnium cædium quæ in tali bello vel potius impia strage fierent, atque insuper irregularitatem ex delicto, id est formalis homicidii causa, incurrisse, secundum decreta Patrum ac Summorum Pontificum sancita.

Capitulum Secundum.

De necessitate et legitimis causis ad bellum justum requisitis.

Quia vero pacem habere debet voluntas, bellum necessitas, et bellum vere bellua est quæ omnia devorat, ideo non licet absque gravi causa, et nisi vera et quasi extrema necessitate juste imperante, suscipere bellum. Testatur enim Nicolaus Papa in Responsis ad Consulta Bulgarorum, omni tempore armis abstinendum, nisi necessitas urgeat atque inevitabilis importunarum rerum adsit concurrentia. Abhorreant ergo Christiani principes et populi a falsis bellorum causis, seu potius a suggestionibus Diaboli, qui ab initio homicida erat. Olli non semel aurem præbuere cæci homines, quum ad bellandum se motos prædicarent, nunc propter vanam gloriam, seu, ut aiunt, præstigium nationale, sub cujus vocabuli fumo latet superbia vitæ, apud Joannem damnata, peccatum Draconis qui pugnabat cum Angelis ejus; nunc propter imperii extendendi vel divitiis augendi desiderium, quod non est aliud nisi concupiscentia oculorum, radix omnium malorum cupiditas, et avaritia, ab Apostolo dicta idolorum servitus; nunc etiam propter invidiam erga cæteras nationes vel principes, furorem hunc Caïnicum, quem semper abominabitur Dominus, qui solus est jure æmulator justissimus, et cujus nomen privative vocatur Zelotes. Etenim hæc eadem peccata æque ac magis detestanda sunt in Nationibus et Guberniis, quæ in hominibus privatis damnantur. At vere horrendum esset dicere insontes homines, qui, sive ut ostentarent se esse validos pugiles, aut gladiatores, sive ut aliena raperent, sive ut invidiæ cederent, proximos privata auctoritate occidere meditarentur. Igitur non moveatur unquam bellum, nisi de necessario repetundis Juribus, vel hostium injuste invadentium propulsandorum causa.

Capitulum Tertium.

De officiis et obedientia Ducum ac Militum.

Secundum Divi Augustini sententiam, ad malos jure puniendos, bella gerenda ab ipsis bonis suscipiuntur, quum in eo humanarum rerum ordine inveniuntur, ubi eos vel jubere tale aliquid vel in talibus obedire juste ordo ipse constringit. Sciant ergo Duces ac Milites se militare debere tanquam bonos viros, Deo sacramento Baptismi ligatos, ac proinde juramentum seu quod vocant sacramentum Militiæ non adversari legi Christianæ, nec unquam adversari posse. Hinc nihil in bello justo agant contra Jus Gentium; immunitates personarum et rerum Deo sacrarum, necnon ruricolarum et operariorum artibus pacis incumbentium, feminarum, puerorum, senum et omnium innocentium agnoscant, et rite observent; se esse justitiæ servos ac ministros, non autem crudelitatis, nec cupiditatis, nec vanæ gloriæ, meminerint; contenti stipendiis suis, neminem concutientes, legitime in suo quisque gradu superioribus suis obedientiam præstent.

Capitulum Quartum.

De Auctoritate et Consilio in bellis suscipiendis et forma Judicii de Justitia Belli.

Quoad bellum suscipiendum Auctoritas et Consilium non apud cives singulatim sumptos, sed apud Nationes et earum Principes et Gubernia est. Nam cives singuli, si læsi fuerint, jure possunt ad superiores appellare vel recurrere, quin inter se aut cum alienigenis pugnent; et ordo naturalis, mortalium paci accommodatus, requirit ut ita se Res Militaris habeat. Verumtamen si in Ecclesia Dei cautum est ne episcopus absque Consilio aliquid agat, pari saltem norma circa tanti momenti rem Nationes seu earum Principes et Gubernia uti necesse perspicitur. Quapropter, ut justitia et justitiæ forma in bellis suscipiendis caute servetur, opus est ut leges cujusque regni et populi statuant viros non tantum peritos, sed et maxime probos consulendos esse, a quibus secundum Jus Gentium et leges evangelicas, necnon et canonicas seu Pontificias, causarum belli justitia prudenter examinetur et libere declaretur. Nam Jure disceptare, est juste judicare; et non est judex, si non est in eo Justitia.

Votum Synodi.

I. Universi compertum est, quot quantaque scelera et mala tam spiritualia quam temporalia novissimis præsertim hisce temporibus ab iniustis bellis dimanaverint, ita ut fundamentales societatis humanæ conditiones subverti videantur.

II. Hæc eadem calamitas Orientem quoque invadit miserrimis suis effectibus, et ad gentem nostram Ecclesiamque, et ad universam in Oriente rem Catholicam teterrima exinde damna oriuntur, quibus, ut rem pro veritate dicamus, obnoxium quoque est providissimum paternumque nostrum Gubernium, cui gratum habet animum tota Armena Hierarchia, præsertim pro religiosa libertate, qua ipsa fruitur.

III. Hæc autem calamitosa conditio magis noxia evadere dignoscitur, eo quod sit teterrimus effectus perversorum quorumdam principiorum, quibus iustitia et iura gentium conculcantur.

IV. Hinc non amplius iustitia, sed ius fortioris, aut secretarum molimina societatum in humanam societatem ubique grassantur.

V. Hinc principia quoque Christianæ moralitatis sus deque vertuntur per illas neotericas perversasque doctrinas, quas nonnullæ ephemerides, factæ iam impietatis instrumenta, et secretarum societatum conatus per omnes regiones excitare atque propagare nituntur, et iam præruptus tantæ impietatis torrens nostras quoque plagas invadit.

VI. Speciatim vero idea præcepti Decalogi, "Non occides" cuius custos et interpres est ipsa Sancta Catholica Ecclesia, propter iniusta bella tam vitiata est in mente populi, ut inter bella iusta ac iniustas cædes stragemque iam omne discrimen ablatum videatur, neque inter utrumque populus discernere valeat.

VII. Sed quia Christus Dominus noster, eum suam in terra instituit Ecclesiam, illi soli non modo Divinæ suæ revelationis tradidit depositum, sed et infallibilis magisterii auctoritatem usque ad consummationem sæculi duraturam, neque per gentium vel regionum amplitudinem limitandum, eius officium est, omnibus gentibus et nationibus iustitiam ac moralem Evangelii legem prædicare ac docere, et hæc inerrabilis magisterii inviolabilis auctoritas in persona Petri legitimis eius Successoribus est concredita.

VIII. Quamvis autem zelantissimi Ecclesiæ Ministri vocem suam extollentes, perversa hæc principia impugnare iusque gentium ac sacra moralitatis principia propugnare et bella iusta inter ac cædem stragemque discrimina populos edocere pro viribus conentur, attamen inter clamores impietatis vox zelantissimorum Pastorum iam ferme extingui videtur.

IX. Quare Patres huius Synodi, miserrimum hoc spectaculum a longe non sine lacrymis aspicientes, et horum principiorum, quæ omnia delere minantur, quæque libertatis, nationalitis et similium fallacium nominum sub velo abscondita sunt, giganteos Orientem versus impetus conspicientes, apprime intellexerunt, quod eo magis aggressiones istæ noxiæ sunt nobis, quo debilior est conditio nostra.

X. Quapropter hæc omnia in hac nationali Synodo contemplantes et in tribunali iustitiæ perpendentes, Patres Synodales

vocem suam ad Cathedram Romanam et Tibi Vicario Domini nostri Iesu Christi, cui concredita est suprema infallibilis magisterii auctoritas, extollunt, et his præsentibus scriptis Synodalibus consilium suæ mentis Tibi proponere festinant, et Te Christi Vicarium adprecantur, ut si opportunum Tibi videbitur, gravis hæc et valde necessaria quæstio imminenti Œcumenico proponatur Concilio, et ius gentium solemniter ibidem proclametur atque tyrannica iuris fortioris principia penitus condemnentur, et Divini præcepti "Non occides" vera notio omnibus prædicetur, bellaque iniusta vere cædem stragemque constituere denuo confirmetur. Hinc et solemniter iusti belli conditiones iuxta canonicum ius, quod ubique proculcatur, ab eodem Œcumenico Concilio infallibili auctoritate publicentur. Et quia universa hæc impietas, quæ omnia destruere minatur, necessario exigit, ut in applicatione principiorum Christianæ moralitatis et canonum Ecclesiæ, permanens et incessans veritatis oraculum quocumque vocem suam extendere, omniumque conscientiam tutam reddere possit: Quapropter hæc ipsa Synodus illud valde necessarium esse reverenter ac humiliter credit, quod Œcumenico Concilio, si ita Tibi videbitur, proponatur, ut apud Sedem Petri permanens supremumque ex omnium gentium iuris peritis compositum Tribunal constituatur, quod in verbo belli examinet et perpendat, utrum mutuæ societatum relationes cum moralibus Christianæ Religionis legibus conveniant; ac nomine Sedis Petri defensor iurium gentis constituatur, cuius vox iuridica ab infallibili Tua auctoritate, qui Vicarius es Christi, confirmata, canon seu regula publicæ constituatur conscientiæ; quo fiet etiam ut humana societas ab imminentis ruinæ præcipitio erepta, quo perversa præsentis temporis socialia principia trahendo deiicere eam minantur, tandem aliquando quiescat; et Gubernia ab immani illa necessitate liberentur ingentes perpetuo alendi exercitus, qui cum magno sint incitamento socialis corruptionis morum, innumeras quoque ærumnas teterrimosque effectus progignunt, populisque iam intolerabile pondus omnino efficiuntur.

II

The Petition of English Protestants to the Holy Father for the restoration of the Law of Nations is to be found on page 366 of the *Acta et Decreta SS. Concilii Vaticani*.

"A Letter from Certain English Protestants to the Supreme Pontiff, in which they intreat him to undertake the Charge of guarding the Law of Nations in regard to those Nations not yet civilised.

"Having long sought, but in vain, to induce the prelates and ecclesiastics of the divers communions to which we belong to resist the acts, practices and maxims contrary to the Law of

Nations, or at least to denounce them, we address ourselves to Your Holiness, in the hope that you will take means to put an end to this public disorder, and that, in the measures you take, you may understand the particular errors which we submit to you.

"The ancient relations established by conquest and administration which have given Great Britain command over regions situated outside Europe, inhabited by Brahmins, Buddhists, Hindus, Mussulmans and Pagans, have endangered in these far-off regions the integrity of the English, by exposing them to more than ordinary temptations.

"Treaties have been violated, blood has been unjustly shed, outrages of various sorts have been perpetrated on innocent persons.

"To justify these guilty actions, a maxim has been introduced and even publicly proclaimed by the highest political authority of modern times, Sir Robert Peel, declaring that Christians are not subject to the Law of Nations, nor to the precepts of justice in their dealings with those who are a danger to Christianity or civilisation.

"We are assured that the Fathers of the Catholic Church, the Popes and the Councils, have condemned and denounced often and with authority such maxims as being contrary to the Will of God and to the laws of man, and exposing all those who execute them or take part in them to being banished from the Christian Communion.

"Seeing that any State, however powerful it may be, cannot be safe while such practices reign in it; that any man, however pious he be, is no better than an infidel who in such a matter cannot distinguish between good and evil; seeing that all bodies of Christians have ceased in this respect to teach the Law of God, we appeal to Your Holiness to declare anew, whether by virtue of your own authority or through the Council which is about to assemble, that Law and those maxims which were declared and imposed of old by the See which Your Holiness occupies to-day, so that they may become a guide for the conduct of those of our compatriots who belong to that Church of which Your Holiness is the Head, as well as a light for the whole world.

"We have learnt that Your Holiness has refused absolution and the consolations of religion to those who, being impenitent, have repudiated, by a pretended act of their own will, the duties of allegiance towards our Sovereign, and who do not consider themselves guilty of a crime when they commit illegal acts in obedience to the orders of those to whom they have sworn blind obedience.

"We pray Your Holiness to treat in like manner those Kings and their Ministers who at this time are not controlled by any tribunal nor liable to any punishment."

APPENDIX IV

A LIST OF SOME OF DAVID URQUHART'S WRITINGS.

Political, Social, and Historical.

1833. Turkey and its Resources (5th edition, 1835).
1834. England, France, Russia and Turkey. Pamphlet.
1835. The Portfolio; or, A Collection of State Papers, etc., illustrative of the History of our own Times. 6 vols. December, 1835–1837.
1839. The Spirit of the East. 2 vols.
1843. The Portfolio. New Series. 6 vols. 1843–1844.
1844. Reflections on Thoughts and Things.
1845. Wealth and Want; or, Taxation as influencing Private Riches and Public Liberty.
1849. The Pillars of Hercules. 2 vols.
1853. Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South.
1855. Constitutional Remedies. Handbook for the Committees.
1855. Familiar Words as affecting the Character of Englishmen and the Fate of England
1856. The Free Press. First issued as a penny weekly paper, then as a monthly periodical. Editor: Collet Dobson Collet. 1856–1866.
1866. The Diplomatic Review. (The Free Press was so renamed.) A quarterly journal. 1866–1877.
1860. The Lebanon. 2 vols.

Also innumerable pamphlets, critiques, and reviews.

Writings more directly concerning the Council.

1874. The Four Wars of the French Revolution. This came out first in the Diplomatic Review, and was reprinted as a pamphlet.
1869. Appeal of a Protestant to the Pope to restore the Law of Nations. The same in Latin and French.
1869. Effect on the World of the Restoration of the Canon Law; being a vindication of the Catholic Church against a Priest.
1871. Le Patriarche Hassoun; Le Schisme Arménien et le Concile Œcuménique.
1871. Sequel to the Appeal of a Protestant to the Pope: The Military Oath and Christianity.
1871. La Désolation de la Chrétienté.

Many pamphlets in French appeared about this time; also a French edition of the Diplomatic Review, which began in 1868 and was continued till 1875.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL EVENTS IN DAVID URQUHART'S LIFE.

1805. Born.
1813. Taken abroad.
1821. Entered at St. John's College, Oxford.
1827. Takes part in the Greek War of Independence under Lord Cochrane. First Lieutenant on Frigate *Hellas*. Severely wounded.
1828. Leaves the Greek Navy.
At Samos with Colleti, the Governor of the island.
1829. Immediately after the Treaty of Adrianople goes to Constantinople. Introduced to the Sultan; sent by the Sultan with his own guards and horses on a geological expedition to Thrace.
1830. For a few months at the Turkish Court. Returns to England through Albania.
1831. Letters to the *Courier* on the Eastern Question which attracts the attention of William IV.
Introduced to Sir Stratford Canning, and sent on secret mission to the Balkans.
1832. Returns to England via Italy, Hungary and Germany.
1833. Articles on European Commerce, particularly the German Customs Union, which results in his being sent on a second secret mission, this time a commercial one.
Publishes *Turkey and its Resources*.
1834. Preparing commercial treaty between England and Turkey.
In the East for the second time.
Intimacy with Lord Ponsonby.
Visit to Circassia.
Publishes *England, France, Russia, and Turkey*.
1835. During the whole of this year a flood of articles on the Eastern and Russian Questions, either written or inspired by him, appears in all the principal periodicals and newspapers.
Appointment as First Secretary to Embassy at Constantinople (Commission gazetted October 3, 1835).
Portfolio issued from December, 1835, to June, 1836.
1836. Leaves England for Constantinople in company with Sir John McNeil, travelling via Munich, Vienna and Wallachia.
1837. Recalled.
1838. Government issues commercial treaty with Turkey.
Urquhart begins his crusade.
Letters to *The Times*, *Era*, *Morning Advertiser*, etc., etc.
Midlands and North taken by storm. Invited by city magnates to a public dinner at Glasgow. First public speech. Chambers of Commerce started by his influence.

1839. Death of his mother.
Publishes the *Spirit of the East.*
Diplomatic Transactions in Central Asia.
Exposition of the Boundary Differences.
First contact with Chartists.

1840. Attacks Chartists' strongholds; captures many of their leaders by preaching international justice in lieu of class warfare. Forms converted Chartists into "Associations for the Study of Diplomatic Documents."
Gathers round him a large circle of friends.
Private mission to the French people on the occasion of the treaty of July 15.

1841–1846. Political knight-errantry in France, Spain, and Morocco.
Multifarious literary activities amongst which the most prominent are—
Portfolio, New Series, October, 1843–1844.
Reflections on Thoughts and Things.
Wealth and Want.

1847. Elected by an overwhelming majority as Member of Parliament for Stafford.

1849. Serious breakdown in health.
Visit to Syria and in the East; collects materials for *The Lebanon.*
Meets the Abbé Hamilton, who is on a mission from Rome to the East. From him gains an insight into Uniate Question.

1850. Further visit to Constantinople.
Pillars of Hercules published.

1853. Russian Army mobilised.
Urquhart begins to preach against the coming war, reforms the Foreign Affairs Committees and starts many new ones.

1854. War with Russia declared in March.
Marriage to Harriet Angelina Forteseue.
General Election; declines to stand.
Sheffield Free Press, under the editorship of Ironside, becomes the Urquhart organ. Eventually transferred to London.
Occupied with organisation of Foreign Affairs Committees. Great meetings held in all the chief towns in England.

1856. Begins his twenty years' crusade against the "Declaration of Paris."
Turkish baths established in England.

1856–1864. Work of the Foreign Affairs Committees on current events (Indian Mutiny, Chinese War, Polish Insurrection, American Civil War, Italian War of Liberation, etc.) under his inspiration and guidance.

1864. Breakdown in health necessitates residence abroad—visits Paris, Rouen, Nice, Genoa.
Syllabus of Pius IX. issued.
1865. Châlet des Mélèzes built.
1867. Pius IX. announces to the Bishops assembled for the centenary of St. Peter his intention of summoning a General Council.
Short visit to England. Tour of the Foreign Affairs Committees with a view of preparing them for his appeal to the Pope.
1867–1869. Work in preparation for the appeal to the Pope.
Mr. and Mrs. Urquhart go to Rome, November, 1869.
Vatican Council opened December 8, 1869.
1870. In Rome till June.
Franco-Prussian War.
1871. Diplomatic relations established between the Vatican and the Porte, due to his exertions.
1872. *Désolation de la Chrétienté* published.
Attempts at the establishment in France of a National Tribunal to decide questions of peace and war.
1874. Visit to England.
Tour of Foreign Affairs Committees.
Great speech at Keighley.
Reviews origin and work of Committees.
Successfully resists the designs of Russia to gain England's active participation in the Congress of Brussels.
1876. Journey to Egypt in a vain search for health.
1877. Dies at Naples, May 17.

INDEX

Aali, Pasha, Grand Vizier, 247, 285
Adrianople, Peace of, 8, 9, 44, 55
Afghan War, 142 *ff.*
Albania, 44, 45
Alexander I. of Russia, 6, 7
American Civil War, 134, 135, 152
Angelis, Cardinal de, 263
Anstey, Thomas Chisholm: impeaches Lord Palmerston, 121; account of, 143 *note;* introduces Urquhart to Cardinal Capaccini, 185; connection of, with Oxford Movement, 226
Antonelli, Cardinal, 254, 255
Armellini, Père, 275
Armenian Schism, 276 and *note*
Armenian Synod, 249, 258 *ff.*
Armenians, 257
Arras, 209
Associations for investigating Foreign Affairs: mismanagement of, 116; reasons for failure of, 117 *ff.* *See also* Committees for the Investigation of Diplomatic Documents
Attwood, Charles, 81, 95, 103, 107, 135
Attwood, Thomas, 72
Aymond, Père, 232
Azarian, Mgr., 249, 264

Backhouse, 53
Barroll, 180
Barrot, Odilon, 115, 116
Beaumont, Somerset, 62
Behrens, 24, 25
Bell family, 57
Bell, George, 61
Benbow, William, 94
Bentham, Jeremy, 21, 34, 35
Bentinck, Cavendish, 155
Benyouski, 89 *note*, 98 *note*
Benst, Count, 211
Birmingham Mutual Improvement Society, 155 *ff.*
Bishopstone, Landholders' Court, 309
Bismarck, Count von, 5, 131 *note*
Black, Dr., 71
Bodenham, de la Barre, 256
Bonnechose, Cardinal de, 263, 264, 269, 270
Booth, John, 147
Bréda, Comte de: in Rome, 263; proposes a *Ligue des Faibles* to Aali Pasha, 285, 286; on French desire for revenge, 292
Bright, John, 146
British and Foreign Review, 45 *note*
Brun, Lucien, 290
Brussels, Congress of, 142, 160, 161
Bucher, Lothair, 130 *note*, 133
Burdett, Sir Francis, 62 and *note*
Burns, Sir Alexander, 143, 144, 145

Cabet, French Deputy, 111
Canning, George, 9, 10
Canning, Sir Stratford, 45
Canon Law, 142, 208, 209
Capaccini, Cardinal, 22, 185 *ff.*
Capalti, Cardinal, 275
Capodistrias, 44
Cardo, William, Chartist: gives his adherence to Urquhart, 85 *ff.*; aids Urquhart's campaign among working men, 92 *ff.*; gains adherence of Richards for Urquhart, 97; abuse of, by former associates, 101; speaks at meeting at Carlisle, 105, 106
Cargill, William, 81, 95, 96, 117
Catholic Church, 194, 212, 219 *ff.*
Catholic Emancipation Act, 223
Catholic Magazine, 222 *note*
Caucasus, 55, 68
Cavour, 194, 201 *note*
Central Democratic Association, 84
Chalet des Mélèzes, 205, 206 *note*, 322
Charnowski, General, 110
Chinese War, 13, 147 *ff.*
Circassia, 54 *ff.*, 214
Circassians, 22, 55
Cobbett, James, 94
Cobbett, William, 282
Cockrane, Lord, 34
Coletti, Governor of Samos, 114 and *note*.

Collet, Charles Dobson, 136 and *note*
Collet, Père, 233
Committees for the investigation of Diplomatic Documents, 98. *See also* Associations for investigating Foreign Affairs
Conolly, Lancashire, 135
Consolato del Mare, 151 and *note*
Constantine, Russian Viceroy, 8
Conversations Lexicon, 46
Courier Français, 108
Crimean War, 11, 12, 24, 123 *ff.*

Defourny, Abbé: meets Urquhart at Rheims, 232; on the delays of Vatican Council, 273; on attitude of French Bishops to Vatican Council, 277; promoter of the Society of the *Œuvre Apostolique*, 286, 287; introduces deputation of Foreign Affairs Committees to French Assembly, 290
Delane of *The Times*, 13
Denbigh, Lord, 233, 265
Detroisier, 71
Diobitch, 9, 10
Diplomatic College, 264, 268, 275
Diplomatic Review, 319
Disraeli, Benjamin, 23, 123
Dunlop, 146
Dupanloup, Mgr.: Urquhart's friendship with, 23; first meeting with, 232; failure of, to support appeal to the Pope, 239; incites Eastern Catholics against Decree of Infallibility, 256, 257; Urquhart's interview with, in Rome, 260, 261; Pope receives submission of, 276

Eastern Bishops, 255, 256, 259, 261
East India Company, report of, on Afghan War, 143

Fielden, 72
Fischel, Edward, 133
Foreign Affairs Committees: formation of, 120, 124 *ff.*; Urquhart's training of, 125 *f.*, 310; character of members of, 134 *ff.*; organisation of, 136 *ff.*; insist on publication of suppressed despatches on Afghan War, 142 *ff.*; issue addresses to soldiers and sailors about to sail on Chinese Expedition, 148, 149; address the Emperor of the French on Declaration of Paris, 153, 154; set forth dangers of Congress of Brussels, 160 *f.*; petition Disraeli against representation of England at Congress of Brussels, 160; manifold activities of, 162; attitude of Press towards, 163 *note*; failure of, due partly to Urquhart's own character, 172 *ff.*; respond to teaching on Canon Law, 209; lead men from Secularism and Atheism, 289; deputation of, to French Assembly, 290, 291
France: attitude of England and Russia towards, 104; attitude of, towards Vatican Council, 239; Catholic Church in, 277; bitterness of, towards England, 291; dislike of "National Tribunals," 291.
Franchi, Mgr.: Urquhart's friendship with, 23, 233, 263 and *note*, 268, 269; entrusted with Memorandum to the Pope, 274; goes to Constantinople as Papal Envoy, 285; approves of "National Tribunals," 291
Franco-Prussian War, 153, 154
Frankpledge, 306, 307
Free Press, 135, 147, 319
French Catholics, Urquhart gains a hearing from, 231, 232
Frost the Chartist, 89, 98 *note*, 170, 171 *note*
Fuad Pasha, 246
Fyler, George, 81, 86, 87

Garibaldi, 194, 199, 310 *ff.*
German Customs Union, 25, 45, 215
Ghica, I., 63 *note*
Ghizzi, Cardinal, 189
Gillies, Dr., 190
Gioberti, 191, 202
Gladstone, W. E., 155 *ff.*, 162
Gratry, Père, 22, 133; *Les Sources*, 207
Greece, Urquhart's connection with, 7, 8
Greek War of Independence, 7, 44
Gregory XVI., Pope, 22, 180 *note*, 184 *note*, 219
Grenoble, 209
Grotius, 207
Grove, Mary Ann, 100
Guizot, 115

Hadford, 145, 146
Hamilton, Abbé, 189, 190
Harney, Julius, 93
Hassoun, Patriarch, 248, 276 and *note*
Haynau, 84
Herald, 61 *note*, 200, 295

Hetherington, Henry, 71, 94
Holy Alliance, 223
Hyacinth, Père, 253 *note*

Ireland, 203 *note*
Italian Unity, 198 *ff.*
Italian War of Liberation, 194, 205

Jesuits, 179, 264; *Études*, 287
Jullion, Père, 232, 233, 238, 286
Juvigny, 209, 232

Kaye, 143, 146
Keighley, 161

Lamington, Lord, 174 *note*
Las Casas, 295
Law of Nations, 207, 208, 253
Lebanon, Mount, 68
Le Play: Urquhart's friendship with, 23, 207 and *note;* agrees with Urquhart in welcoming the Council, 216; studies social life in the East, 240; *Réforme Sociale*, 241; criticises Urquhart, 242, 243; inaugurates *Union de la Paix Sociale*, 287; introduces deputation of Foreign Affairs Committees to French Assembly, 290
Lieven, Countess (later Princess), 10, 99 *note*
Louis Philippe, 14
Lowery, Robert: a "Foreign Policy Man," 92; member of Chartist Convention, 95; Monteith's opinion of, 96; goes on deputation to Paris, 105; interviews Faucher, editor of *Courier Français*, 108, 109; letter of, from Paris to Chairman of Newcastle Committee, 108 *ff.*; letter of, to Chairman of London Committee, 110, 111; discouraged about future of Committees, 116, 117
Lucca, Cardinal de, 263

Macclesfield Foreign Affairs' Committee, 266, 271
McNeil, Sir John, 24 *note*
Mahmoud II., Sultan of Turkey, 9, 44, 45
Malan, Cæsar, 33
Manchester, 84
Manin, Daniele, 192
Manley, General, 190
Manning, Archbishop, 233, 237
Marriott, Charles, 226 *note*
Marx, Karl, 130 *note*, 270
Marylebone, 85
Maupied, Dr., 254, 255
Mayence, Bishop of, 233
Mazzini, 194, 195 *ff.* and *note*
Mehemet Ali, 11, 104
Mermillod, Auxiliary Bishop of Geneva: a friend and ally of Urquhart, 233; sketch of, 244 *note;* sends Monteith on his mission to the East, 249; supports Urquhart in Rome, 262
Metropolitan Trades Union, 94
Metternich, 6, 7, 14
Middle Ages, Urquhart's love for, 211, 212
Mignet, 114
Mill, John Stuart, 133, 152, 153
Milosh, Prince, of Servia, 48, 197
Molesworth, Sir William, 72
Monteith, Robert: friendship with Urquhart, 62; aids Urquhart's work among working men, 81; opinion of Cardo, 94; opinion of Lowery, 96; describes Urquhart's campaign among working men, 99, 100; assists in founding Committees, 135; a Catholic, 233; goes on a mission to the Armenian Synod, 248, 249; in Rome during the Council, 256; describes Christmas at the Vatican in 1870, 278
Morning Post, 105
Mozeley, 226 *note*

National Tribunals, 289 *ff.*
National Union of the Working Classes, 94
Nevers, Bishop of, 262, 263
Newcastle Foreign Affairs Committee, 144
Newman, J. H., 226
Noë, Comte de, 111
Normanby, Lord, 88, 91
Northern Liberator, 105, 107 *note*
Northern Political Union, 93, 96

O'Brien, Bronterre, 86, 87, 91 and *note*
O'Connor, Feargus, 91, 116
Œuvre Apostolique, 209, 286, 287
Ollivier, Emile, 239
Oxford, 34, 44, 226 *note*
Oxford, Bishop of, 225

Palmerston, Lord: character of, 12 *ff.*, Urquhart's views on, 12 *ff.*; sends Urquhart to Constantinople, 48; hostility of, to Urquhart, 52 *ff.*; recalls Urquhart from Constantinople, 54; conduct of, in *Vixen*

incident, 57, 58; Urquhart's quarrel with, over Turkish Commercial Treaty, 70; antipathy of, to Louis Philippe, 104; impeachment of, 121; charge against, in matter of Afghan despatches, 144
Papacy, the: Urquhart's views on, 22, 220 *ff.*; temporal power of, dependent on law, 180, 237, 238; Russia's greatest stumbling-block, 195
Papal Infallibility, dogma of, 211, 253, 259
Paris, Declaration of, 26, 142, 149 *ff.*
Peel, 14, 318
Philippe, Père, 232
Pisani, 51
Pitra, Cardinal, 263
Pius IX.: Urquhart's hope in, 189 *ff.*; reforming ideas of, dispelled, 190 *ff.*; popular feeling towards, in Italy, 198 *note;* calls a General Council, 210, 211; attempts to prejudice him against Urquhart, 264, 265; Urquhart's audience of, 265 *ff.*; Urquhart's impressions of, 268; interest of, in Urquhart's cause 268; sends Urquhart a brief of thanks for *Désolation de la Chrétienté*, 283
Place, Francis, 71
Polish Rebellion of 1830, 8
Ponsonby, Lord: opinion of Urquhart, 23; friendship with Urquhart, 48, 51 *note;* disagreement with Urquhart in Constantinople, 50*ff.*; letter of, to Palmerston on Circassia, 55, 56; *Letters on the Eastern Question*, 123 *note*
Poore, Mayor, 135 and *note*, 301 *ff.*
Postulatum de Re Militari et Bello, 259 *note*, 260, 269, 272, 313
Prokesch, Baron, 284 *note*
Prussia, Urquhart's views on, 5

Ramière, Père, 287, 288, 293
Reformation, 223
Reschid Mohammed, Pasha, 45
Rheims, 209, 232
Richards, John, 92, 100, 105, 106
Rickmansworth, 137, 174 *note*
Roebuck, Thomas, 72, 143
Rodez, Bishop of: friendship with Urquhart, 233, 262; mentions *Appeal to the Pope* in his Lenten Pastoral, 237; mentioned in Mrs. Urquhart's diary, 270; on the delays of the Council, 276
Roh, Père, 262, 263, 284 *note*
Rolland, Major, 135, 136
Rome, Church of: alone untouched by Russian diplomacy, 184; embodies Urquhart's hopes for the world, 213, 274; embodiment of law, 221; Urquhart's views on connection of, with the East, 253, 254; resumes diplomatic relations with Sublime Porte, 285 and *note*
Rome, condition of, in 1870, 277, 278
Rosmini, 191
Ross, David, of Bladensburgh: works for Urquhart in Northern towns, 81; assists in founding Committees, 135; anecdote of Urquhart related by, 137 *note;* works for Urquhart's plans in Rome, 189
Rule, David, 134, 160, 161, 290
Russell, Lord John, 72
Russia: Urquhart's views on, 2 *ff.*, 47; hostility to *Entente Cordiale*, 104; connection of, with Italian Revolution, 197, 198; mystery of, 214, 215
Rustem Bey, 231, 246, 264

Salisbury Times, 304 *ff.*
Sangelgian, Abbé, 275
Sardinia, 202
Schools of Public Law, 136, 150
Schroeder, Baron, 231, 248
Sebastopol, 11, 12, 124
Servia, 48, 68, 197, 198
Shepperd, William, 121 and *note*
Sinclair, Sir George, 62, 203 *note*
Singleton, William, 132, 289, 299
Smith, A., 152
Smith, Gerald, 44
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 147
Sorèze College, 20 *note*
Stafford, 120, 147, 148
Stanley of Alderley, Lord, 150 *note*, 263
Stapleton, A. G., 133
Stephens, Chartist Leader, 130, 160
Stobart, G., 145
Stonyhurst, 179 *ff.*
Strossmayer, Bishop, 261
Stuart, Lord Dudley, 87
Suffield, Father, 253 *note*
Syllabus, 212
Szulcheski, 196

Taylor, Sir Herbert, 44, 197
Taylor, Dr. John: denounces Foreign Policy of Government, 93; arrest of, 94; interview with Urquhart, 100, 101; death of, 101 *note*
Taylor, Colonel Pringle, 86, 102
Thiers, 24, 104, 115

Thomas, Chartist, 105
Thomason, Chartist, 92, 96, 97, 100, 105
Times, newspaper, 13, 58, 200
Toqueville, A. de, 109
Turkey: Urquhart's views on, 2 *ff.*; residence of Urquhart in, 45, 46
Turkish bath, the, 174 *note*, 175 and *note*, 251
Turkish Commercial Treaty: Urquhart draws up, 46; conceded by Government, 48, 49: increases Urquhart's influence in Turkey, 52; made public, 58, 59 and *note;* Urquhart's quarrel with Palmerston over, 70
Turkish Government, 65 *ff.*, 245, 246
Turks, Urquhart's intimacy with, 22

Ullathorne, Dr., 190
United States, 151, 152
Unkiar Skelessi, Treaty of, 47
Urquhart, Charles, 34
Urquhart, David: views of, on international politics, 2 *ff.*; on Russia, 2 *ff.*, 47, 167; on Turkey, 2 *ff.*; on Prussia, 5, 286; on Prussian Commercial League, 25 and *note;* on Lord Palmerston, 12 *ff.*; on Medieval and Eastern methods of government, 73 *ff.*; on Middle Ages, 77; on government, 90; on Blockade of Mexico, 102, 103; on dialectic, 102; on Treaty of July 15, 1840, 105; on failure of associations for Investigating Foreign Affairs, 117; on Declaration of Paris, 150 *ff.*; on Right of Search, 150; on Congress of Brussels, 159, 160; on Catholic Church, 182 *ff.*, 218 *ff.*, 293; on diplomatic training, 188, 189; on Russian influence in Italy, 194, 195; on Italian independence, 201, 202; on the syllabus, 212; on dangers overshadowing Europe, 213, 215; on the Oxford Movement, 226; on Temporal Sovereignty of Pope, 237, 238, 278; on Papal Infallibility, 238; connection of, with Greece, 7, 8; with Turkish Commercial Treaty, 46, 48, 52, 58 *ff.*; with Circassia, 54 *ff.*; with Chartists, 70, 71, 82 *ff.*; relations of, with Catholics, 22, 23; with Sultan of Turkey, 44, 48; with Lord Ponsonby, 48, 51 *note;* with Monteith, 62 and *note;* with working men, 81 *ff.*, 169; with Le Play, 240 *ff.*; with Eastern Catholics, 245, 256, 258, 259; describes visit to M. Thiers, 111 *ff.*; formation of Foreign Affairs Committees, 125, 126; aims of Foreign Affairs Committees, 141; visit to Stonyhurst, 179 *ff.*; audience with the Pope, 265; birth and early education of, 20; matriculation of, at Oxford, 34; character of, 19, 21, 35 *ff.*, 175, 176, 229, 243, 298; popular estimate of, 21, 22; attracts notice of William IV., 44; sent on secret mission to Albania, 45; lives in Turkey, 45 *ff.*; appointed Secretary to Embassy at Constantinople, 48; diplomatic career of, 49 *ff.*; lives in Turkish villages, 51; visits the Caucasus, 68; reputation of, in the East, 22; influence of the East on, 30 *ff.*, 64 *ff.*; *Spirit of the East*, 63 *note*, 65; *Turkey and her Resources*, 23, 46; *Progress of Russia*, 24; *England and Russia*, 47; recalled from Constantinople, 54; conduct of, in *Vixen* incident, 57, 58; the *Portfolio*, 8, 68; views of statesmen on, 22, 23; travels of, 44, 45, 121: description of, by a Polish lady, 41 *ff.*; religious position of, 32, 225, 227 *ff.*; belief of, in the power of man to be right, 26 *ff.*; campaign of, in favour of International justice, 61, 62; urged to enter Parliament, 62, 63; knowledge of the East, 65 *ff.*; sympathy of, with labour troubles, 69 *ff.*; nominated Tory candidate for Marylebone, 70, 85; attitude of, towards working men, 73, 74; abhorrence of, for factory system, 75 *ff.*; *Wealth and Want*, 74 *note*, 123 *note*; takes action on Chartist plot, 87 *ff.*; interview with Dr. Taylor, 100, 101; efforts of, to avert war between England and France, 105 *ff.*; visits M. Coletti, 114 and *note;* interview with M. Nuber, 114, 115; class of mind attracted by, 118; elected Independent Member for Stafford, 120; Parliamentary career of, 121; speaks on motion for impeachment of Palmerston, 121; visits Mount Lebanon, 68, 121; *Pillars of Hercules*, 121 *ff.*; *The Lebanon*, 121; *Three Religio-Political Systems of Europe*, 183; marriage of, 120; *Constitutional Remedies*, 125, 128; *Free Press*, 319; method of, in dealing with men, 127 *ff.*, 133, 134, 137 *ff.*; W. Singleton's first meeting

with, 131 *ff.*; letters to working men, 138, 139; working men's appreciation of, 139, 140; final rupture of, with Church of England, 147; reviews Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*, 226, 227; influence of, on success of Committees, 167; alienation of, from popular ideas, 172; letter of, to Daniele Manin, 192, 201; visits Mazzini, 196 *ff.*; ostracised by the Press, 200; life of, in Savoy, 205, 206; *Diplomatic Review*, 241, 294, 319; introduction of, to Canon Law, 208, 209, 232 *ff.*; Père Jullion writes to Manning about, 233; sympathy of, for the Pope, 244; appeal to the Pope, 233 *ff.*, 237, 239, 244, 245; works to arouse interest of Ottoman Government in Vatican Council, 246 *ff.*; letter to Sultan, 247; in Rome, 250 *ff.*; position in Rome during the Council, 255, 262, 263 *ff.*; brings Eastern and Western Bishops together, 255; leaves memorandum of "work to be done" with Mgr. Franchi, 274, 275; *Désolation de la Chrétienté*, 279, 280, 283, 284 *note*; lays scheme for National Tribunal before French Bishops, 291; *Four Wars of French Revolution*, 279; *Patriarch Hassoun*, 258 *note*; the *Rome*, 294; attempts of French Government to stop propaganda of, 291, 292; returns to England, 1874, 161; addresses meeting at Keighley, 161, 294; last years of, 294; death of, 294; epitaph, 309; chief works of, 319; chronological list of chief events in life of, 320 *ff.*

Urquhart, Harriet Angelina, marriage of, 120; account of Lord Ponsonby's reconciliation with her husband, 51 *note*; on Italian and English Press, 199; importance of, to her husband's cause, 252; writes to her son from Rome, 255, 256; extracts from diary of, 263; describes deputation of English working men to French Assembly, 290; Mrs. Bishop's Life of, 266; letter of, 272, 273

Urquhart, Henrietta, 20 *note*

Urquhart, Margaret, mother of David Urquhart, 20 *note*, 33 and *note*, 34, 44

Vatican Council: Pope announces to assembled bishops his intention of holding, 210; dread of, in diplomatic circles, 211; Urquhart's hope in, 211 *ff.*, 216, 217; Le Play's opinion on usefulness of, 242; Urquhart's connection with, 253; dispersion of, 273

Vattel, 96, 97, 125, 207, 311

Venice, 191, 192, 193

Victor Emmanuel, 194

Vixen, ship, 54, 57, 58 *note*, 61

Ward, Robert, *Maritime Law*, 150 and *note*

Ward, William George, 226 and *note*, 227

Warden, Benjamin, Chartist: opposed to Physical Force policy, 87; "Foreign Policy" man, 92; Urquhart's influence on, 94; speaks at Carlisle on French crisis, 105, 106; denounces Palmerston, 106

Wellington, Duke of, 47

Westrup, 86, 87, 92, 95

White, Sir William, 46 *note*

William IV., 44, 49, 57, 58

Winterslow Land Court, 301

Women's Radical and Female Political Union of Birmingham, 100

Zollverein. *See under* German Customs Union

BILLING AND SONS, LTD., PRINTERS, GUILDFORD, ENGLAND

University of California, Los Angeles
L 005 508 914 8

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 672 083 3